DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 101 135 95 CE 002 882

TITLE	ABE in the Inner City Project: Innovative Practices Study. Final Report, 1970-71.
INSTITUTION	Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Center for Adult Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	71
GRANT	OEG-0-70-5160(324)
NOTE	102p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$5.70 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Basic Education; *Educational Innovation; *Paraprofessional School Personnel; *Program Planning; Staff Improvement; *Urban Areas; Urban Education

ABSTRACT

In its second year the project had two principal goals: (1) to extend the first year's findings with a study of selected innovative practices in a large variety of urban Adult Basic Education (ABE) programs, and (2) to disseminate findings of the project's first two years to urban ABE directors and selected professors of adult education. A questionnaire was developed and sent to the directors of Title III programs in cities over 100,000 population. After review of the data obtained, four practices were selected for further study: (1) the utilization of paid and volunteer paraprofessionals in ABE, (2) the use of learning laboratories for ABE instruction, (3) co-sponsorship of classes with employers and other organizations, and (4) use of community liaison personnel. During the project's second year a second national survey of 1,900 teachers in 59 sample cities was undertaken. The second survey examined the perspectives of public school ABE teachers. The findings were then disseminated in four regional workshops. Recommendations are discussed at length in the areas of: differentiating the target population, differentiating recruitment effort, differentiating class types, co-sponsoring with employers, improving instruction, planning short term objectives, analyzing qualitative factors, improving mentor role relationships, planning staff development, and using program innovations. (BP)

ED101135

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ABE IN THE INNER CITY PROJECT
INNOVATIVE PRACTICES STUDY

FINAL REPORT

1970-71

CENTER FOR ADULT EDUCATION
TEACHERS COLLEGE
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10027

CE 002 882

Office of Education Grant Number OEG-0-70-5160(324)

The Project reported herein was supported by a grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education.

-CONTENTS-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABE in the Inner City Proje

1970-71 Final Report Abstract

In its second year, the Project had two principal goals: (1) to extend the first year's findings with a study of selected innovative practices in a variety of large, urban ABE programs, and (2) to disseminate findings of the Project's first two years to urban ABE directors and selected professors of adult education.

The first year study provided an analytical framework within which innovation in ABE could be effectively analyzed and understood. The second year's work was predicated on the assumption that careful, comparative study of comparable practices in several cities would yield reliable information on factors that facilitate and inhibit innovative and successful program development in ABE.

The first year study had suggested a number of promising practices which seemed to merit further study. To be certain, however, that the Project had a comprehensive view of the variety of innovative practices in Title III programs throughout the country, and the distribution of these practices, a questionnaire was developed and mailed in the spring of 1970 to the directors of all Title III programs in cities over 100,000 in population. Of the 130 cities with populations of this size (1960 Census), 118 had Title III programs operated through the public schools. Questionnaires were returned by the directors of 100 of these programs, indicating the nature and extent of innovation in these cities. After careful review of the questionnaire data and the findings of the first year study, four practices were selected for intensive study in 24 cities. The four practices selected were: (1) the utilization of paid and volunteer paraprofessionals in ABE; (2) the use of learning laboratories for ABE instruction; (3) co-sponsorship of classes with employers and other organizations; and (4) use of community liaison personnel. Each practice was studied in depth in six cities by field researchers from Teachers College and three collaborating universities: Michigan, the University of California, and Northeastern University. Initial analysis of field data was conducted by the field workers and their faculty supervisors. To increase the reliability of the analysis, however, the data were further scrutinized by headquarters staff and by other specialists in both field work methodology and adult basic education practice.

In addition to the field investigations described above, the Project during its second year engaged in several additional research efforts. Two national surveys were undertaken to test the universality of selected findings and to provide additional quantitative data. The first was the survey mentioned above of directors in cities over 100,000 in population. Although this was initiated during the Project's first year, analysis of the returns was undertaken during the second year of the project. A second national survey examined perspectives of public school ABE teachers in cities over 100,000 in population. Pre-tested questionnaires were mailed in the spring of 1971 to every teacher in 59 sample cities - a total of 1900. Completed questionnaires were returned by 1135 teachers, 60 percent of the total.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Findings were disseminated in four regional workshops held in the spring of 1971 in New York, San Francisco, New Orleans, and Chicago. A total of 121 ABE administrators and selected professors of adult education attended. Evaluations of the value of the workshops by participants were highly positive. Further dissemination of Project findings will be accomplished through two forthcoming publications described in the 1970-71 Final Report.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Background

If the urban ABE administrator is to make informed, constructive decisions on program development, spending priorities, staff training and program evaluation, he requires a comprehensive, reliable picture of ABE practice and experience in cities with related problems. Prior to the development of the ABE in the Inner City Project, no such picture was available to the Title III administrator. The administrator who sought to introduce workable innovations lacked any systematic source of information on similar efforts by ABE programs in other parts of the country. He had no modal description of the national experience against which to measure his own efforts, and little opportunity to learn from the failures and successes of other Title III projects.

The ABE Project at Teachers College was funded to develop and disseminate a normative description of current ABE program practice as a context within which the ABE administrator might better understand and evaluate the dynamics of his own program. To this end, the Project in its first year organized and coordinated the observation of field work teams based at four universities. Over a period of nine months, a stratified sample of classes were observed in New York, Boston, San Francisco, San Jose, and Detroit. The Project headquarters staff also conducted more than 100 interviews with ABE administrators and staff in these five cities, as well as in Washington, D.C. From the data collected in field observations and interviews, commonalities and differences among programs were analyzed in the areas of program operation, classroom interaction, and staff and student perspectives. The Project was thus able to formulate the first dependable national picture of current ABE practice grounded in the direct observation of comparable programs. For a detailed description of methodology and findings of the Project's first

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

year, see its 1969-70 Annual Report, Analysis and Interpretation of ABE Experience in the Inner City: Toward a Theory of Practice in the Public Schools.

In its second year, the Project had two principal goals: (1) to extend the first year's findings with a study of selected innovative practices in a variety of large, urban ABE programs, and (2) to disseminate findings of the Project's first two years to urban ABE directors and selected professors of adult education.

Field Study of Innovative Practices

In studying innovative program practices, the Project again sought to generate a grounded theory of practice through intensive field work and comparative analysis of the data thus obtained. The first year study provided an analytical framework within which innovation in ABE could be effectively analyzed and understood. The field staff thus approached its work with special understanding of ABE program structure and problems.

The first year study had suggested a number of promising practices which seemed to merit further study. To be certain, however, that the Project had a comprehensive view of the variety of innovative practices in Title III programs, and the distribution of these practices throughout the country, a questionnaire was mailed in the spring of 1970 to the directors of all Title III programs in cities over 100,000 in population. Of the 130 cities of this size (1960 Census), 118 had Title III programs. Questionnaires were returned by the directors of 100 of these programs indicating the nature and extent of innovation in these cities. After careful review of the questionnaire data and the findings of the first year study, four practices were selected for intensive study, which took us to 24 different cities. The field work was again divided among

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

teams of field researchers at the four universities involved in the first year study - the University of Michigan, Northeastern University, the University of California at San Francisco, and Teachers College, Columbia University.

The University of Michigan team studied the co-sponsorship of ABE classes with employers, community groups, and other organizations. Under the supervision of Professors Eugene Litwak and Donald Warren, two graduate sociology students studied co-sponsorship practices in the Title III programs in Chicago, Lansing, Detroit, St. Louis, Ft. Wayne, and Cincinnati. The work of the Michigan team focused on organizational linkage between the ABE program and the organizations with which the Title III programs cooperated in operating classes. They sought to identify the kinds of programs that could best work together, and to find adaptations in program organization that would facilitate cooperation between ABE and potential co-sponsors.

The use of paraprofessionals and volunteers was studied by the two field workers at the University of California. Professor Barney Glaser acted as Project field coordinator and supervisor of the University of California team. Data collected by the California field workers identified the processes whereby paraprofessionals and volunteers were recruited, the factors which determined the use of the paraprofessional or volunteer in the ABE program (e.g., teacher style, formalization of job description, training, funding, student and paraprofessional expectations), the determinants of compatibility between paraprofessional and teacher, and the factors which governed the longevity of the paraprofessional or volunteer in the program. The field team observed the use of paraprofessionals and volunteers and interviewed relevant participants

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

in Los Angeles, Berkeley, Sacramento, San Jose, Tucson and Denver.

At Northeastern University two field workers from the Project's first year continued under the supervision of Professor Blanche Geer. Use of learning laboratories was studied in Syracuse, Albany, Richmond, Erie, Worcester and Camden.

Analysis of ABE learning laboratories, initiated by the Northeastern team, was extended and elaborated in the spring and fall of 1971 by Professor Richard Videbeck of Teachers College. Professor Videbeck interviewed approximately 45 directors of ABE programs with learning laboratories, observed five of these laboratories in operation, and collected workbooks, manuals, and other documents from an additional 25 laboratories.

The final innovation studied was the use of community liaison personnel. Under the supervision of headquarters staff, a field worker based at Teachers College studied this practice in Yonkers, Hartford, Providence, Nashville, Cleveland and Boston.

Initial analysis of field data was conducted by the field workers and their faculty supervisors. To increase the reliability of the analysis, however, the data were further scrutinized not only by headquarters staff but by other specialists in both field work methodology and adult basic education. Thus Professor Joan Gordon of Quinnipiac College reviewed the field notes and analyses of the Michigan team; Professor Eliot Freidson of New York University reviewed the work of the University of California team; and Professor Gladys Lang of the State University of New York at Stony Brook reviewed the initial work of the Northeastern field staff. Ray Ferrier, Director of Adult Education in Detroit, assessed the field analyses from the perspective of an experienced

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

practitioner. The Project's work thus represents an extension of grounded theory principles to include independent analysis of field data by several specialists to assure greater effectiveness and dependability in interpretation.

National Surveys of ABE Teachers and Administrators

In addition to the field effort described above, the Project during its second year engaged in several additional research efforts. Two national surveys were undertaken to test the universality of selected findings and to provide additional quantitative data.

The first was the survey mentioned above of directors in cities over 100,000 in population. Although this was initiated during the Project's first year, final analysis of the returns was undertaken during the second year of the Project. In addition to providing information on program innovations, the administrative questionnaire provided the Project with extensive data on backgrounds and perspectives of ABE administrators. A copy of the questionnaire is attatched.

A second survey examined perspectives of public school ABE teachers in cities over 100,000 in population. Preliminary 1970 census data showed 150 cities over 100,000 of which 119 had public school ABE programs. The 119 cities were listed in rank order by size and every other city was selected for the sample. (New York City was excluded from the population because of technical difficulties related to school decentralization.) Pre-tested questionnaires were mailed in the spring of 1971 to every teacher in the 59 cities included in the sample - a total of 1901. Completed questionnaires were returned by 1135 or 60 percent of these teachers. A copy of the questionnaire is attatched.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Life Skills Project

During its second year the Project helped finance development of a set of prototype training packages involving lesson plans and supporting multi-media kits for teacher training in areas identified by the study as critically important. This component of the project was directed by Professor Winthrop Adkins of Teachers College who has applied his four-stage model for "life skills" education to the training needs identified by the ABE Project research. The work by Professor Adkins in this area, stimulated by the ABE Project's initial support, received independent financing from the U. S. Office of Education and the New York State Department of Education for FY 1971-72.

Regional ABE Workshops

During the spring of 1971, the ABE Project conducted four regional workshops involving a total of 121 ABE administrators and professors of adult education. The purpose of these workshops was primarily to disseminate the Project's findings to a broad base of ABE practitioners. In addition, they afforded an opportunity for the Project staff to further test detailed findings against the collective experience of conference participants.

The ABE workshops were held in New York, Chicago, San Francisco, and New Orleans. Directors of Title III programs in cities of over 100,000 population were invited, as well as selected university professors of adult education. Rosters of those who attended are attatched.

In advance of each meeting, workshop participants were sent a 38 page conference working paper, Selected Action Implications for Urban ABE Directors (copy attatched). In addition, each conference participant

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

received a copy of the Project's 1969-70 Annual Report. The working paper presented Project findings from both first and second year's work in terms of their action implications for directors. Sections of the paper recapitulated norms of national program practice and suggested alternative approaches for defining target populations, differentiating recruitment efforts, differentiating class types, co-sponsoring classes with employers, improving instruction, planning short-term objectives, analyzing qualitative program factors in connection with program evaluation, improving mentor role relationships, planning staff development, and using program innovations. The working paper presented Project's analyses in a form believed relevant to the immediate concerns of workshop members.

Each workshop extended over a period of one evening and two full days. On the first evening, participants briefly introduced themselves and their programs, and Professor Adkins explained and demonstrated the Life Skills component of the Project.

On the first full day of each workshop, participants were divided into small groups, permitting maximum interchange of ideas. Each group in turn discussed each section of the working paper. Members of the headquarters staff explained in greater depth the Project's data and analyses, and participants in each group suggested the extent to which the Project's findings confirmed or contradicted their own experience. These sessions were taped, and the tapes were later reviewed so that the publications emanating from the second year might reflect the experience of workshop participants.

During the second day, new groups were formed to discuss the implications of the Project's work for change in the practitioners' own

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

programs. These sessions enabled the participants to identify specific practices for back home adaptation and anticipate problems of implementation. Participants could draw upon the relevant experience of other directors, the professors and Project staff to do this. The workshops thus resulted both in a wide dissemination of the Project's work, and in a more effective dissemination procedure than the usual distribution of final reports.

Each workshop concluded with a plenary session in which a panel of ABE administrators and professors of adult education reviewed the workshop discussions and suggested additional avenues of inquiry which the workshops might have neglected.

In addition to their role in the dissemination of Project findings, the workshops provided additional benefits to participants who had an opportunity to talk with a large number of fellow practitioners whom they might not otherwise have met. Participants particularly commented on the value of discussions with directors from other states whom they did not know.

The workshops were carefully evaluated. The evaluation of the first workshop, conducted in New York, included intensive interviews with all participating directors to get their reactions and suggestions for improvement of subsequent workshops. A post-meeting evaluation form was developed and administered at the conclusion of all four workshops. Participants were asked to rate the value of each presentation and group session. (A copy of the workshop evaluation form is appended, with mean scores shown for each item from all four workshops.) Directors were asked to rate the value of the workshop as a whole on a five point scale (1 = little value, 5 = great value). The average rating assigned by the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

77 directors who completed the form was 4.20. Directors were also asked to indicate any modifications in their programs that they were considering as a result of the workshop. A sample of representative responses is given below.

Program Modifications Planned as a Result of Workshop

- "use of feeder classes in new ways"
- "explore student reaction"
- "identify student goals"
- "improve coping skill units"
- "recommend better reporting classifications"
- "feeder centers - outreach and orientation of students"
- "dealing with hard core and staff development"
- "investigate the possibilities of a learning skills center incorporating the use of teaching machines"
- "learning lab"
- "gather more material on coping skills"
- "examine intake to discover ways of reducing dropouts"
- "try out faculty meeting techniques that were suggested"
- "take a real hard look at the feeder class process"
- "intake procedures will be better defined"
- "organize systematic materials acquisitions and evaluation"
- "consider organizing a learning lab"
- "feeder classes by paraprofessionals - more 'in-house' evaluation of program"
- "thinking of putting in a learning lab"
- "seriously considering an orientation class for ESL students - feeder class as you called it"
- "need to look into outreach or satellite classes for orientation of new students"

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- "will be looking into possibility of utilizing more hardware - learning center application"

Publications

The rich and useful data acquired in the Project's first two years of work will take the form of two publications (in addition to the working paper, Selected Action Implications for Urban ABE Directors). The first publication, now in final draft form, is entitled Leadership Strategies for Urban ABE Directors. It is intended to be a practical handbook for key ABE decision-makers, particularly at the local level. Major decisional areas confronted by the ABE administrator are identified, the context of decision-making in each major area is described, and alternative decisional strategies are explored. Chapters corresponding to major decisional areas include setting priorities, recruitment of participants, staffing, in-service training, collaboration and co-sponsorship, and program evaluation.

Also well into preparation is a book which will present in detail the full fruits of our two years of labor. The book is tentatively entitled Last Gamble on Education: Undereducated Adults in the Classroom. It will have twelve chapters: "The Only Game in Town" (introductory overview), "Doping the Action" (methodology of the study), "Rules of the Game" (classroom interaction), "The Players" (student characteristics and perspectives), "The Dealers" (teacher characteristics and perspectives), "The Operators" (ABE directors), "Organizing the Action" (organization and administration), "Using Paraprofessionals" (paid and volunteer aides), "Hustling the Community" (co-sponsorship, community liaison, recruiting), "Off-Track Betting" (learning labs), "Improving the Odds" (action implications), and "A Theory of Practice" (theoretical synthesis).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Project Evaluation

Project evaluator during this year has been Professor Jack London, University of California, Berkeley. He has participated actively with Project personnel throughout the year as well as in the regional workshops. His report will be indipendently submitted to USOE.

We believe the last year has been a productive one and feel confident thatthe publications of our findings will prove of substantial value to the field. Drafts of chapters for both projected books are available for USOE inspection. Last Gamble on Education is currently being rewritten and edited. Reactions from key professionals in the field will be solicited prior to final rewriting and negotiations for publication...

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX I

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF ABE EXPERIENCE IN THE INNER CITY: TOWARD A THEORY OF PRACTICE IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

OEG 0-9-422163-441(324)

SELECTED ACTION IMPLICATIONS FOR URBAN ABE DIRECTORS

Working Paper Prepared for Regional Workshops
May-June, 1971

The work presented herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

CENTER FOR ADULT EDUCATION
TEACHERS COLLEGE
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10027

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONTENTS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROJECT OVERVIEW

This project was funded as a two-year effort. The first year featured a comparative study, using field research methods, of six urban ABE programs. The objective was to develop a comprehensive, dependable normative description of urban program dynamics, and through analysis of commonalities, formulate generalizations useful to decision makers in policy and program development, evaluation, staff training and in setting research and demonstration priorities. This analytical frame of reference, based upon comparative data pertaining to program structure and functional dynamics, classroom interaction and student and teacher perspectives, constitutes the beginnings of a "theory of practice" of urban ABE in the public schools.

The study was undertaken through a collaborative effort by teams working out of the University of California, University of Michigan, Northeastern University and Teachers College, Columbia University, to study ABE programs in San Francisco, San Jose, Detroit, Boston, Washington, D.C., and New York. A team from Columbia conducted 105 one-hour structured interviews with program administrators and staff in the six cities. Participant observers operating from the various campuses were attached to a stratified sample of 59 classes in five cities over a nine month period. From their 237 field reports and interview data, commonalities and differences in program practice, social interaction and perspectives of key actors were analyzed.

Findings were tested against the experience of six leading urban ABE directors in a group consultation. Two national surveys, one of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

124 urban directors and another of 2000 ABE teachers were initiated to further establish universality of findings and provide a needed set of norms on national urban program practice.

The final report covering first year's operations is organized in seven sections, the first on Project development and methodology. The second is an organizational model, a composite analytical description of structure and functional dynamics of the six programs: setting, goals, staff, recruitment, sites and facilities, finance, materials program development and counseling service. Classroom interaction is described and analyzed in the third section with specific attention given attendance maintenance, rules and conventions, instruction, an ideology and tactics of minimizing failure and teacher control. Sections four and five describe participants and teachers respectively: their characteristics, motivations and perspectives -- the way they see themselves in the program, each other, the program as such and, in the case of the teachers, their administrators and supervisors. The role and problems of the counselor and his relationships with teachers and participants is dealt with in sections six. Section seven is devoted to 23 implications for changes in policy, administration, program and staff development.

Second year of the Project involves study of selected program innovations in 24 cities from the vantage point of the first year's findings, using comparative field methods to identify factors impeding and facilitating adoption and development.

The Project also commissioned development of a set of prototype training packages involving lesson plans and supporting multi-media kits for teacher training in areas identified by our study as critically important.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Four regional workshops are being conducted, each involving about forty urban ABE directors, professors of adult education and officials from USOE. These group consultations, designed to test action implications from the research, will explore the potentialities and problems of implementation.

ACTION IMPLICATION FOR ABE DIRECTORS

Our research findings have generated several tentative statements of action implications for urban ABE directors. These are formulated as points of departure for focused discussion, as hypotheses not conclusions. We hope to draw upon collective experience in the workshop to test, elaborate, refine and, as necessary, redefine them. The additional data and new analytical insights which result will be incorporated in the final reports of Project findings.

In this document the term "elementary adult education" (EAE) differentiates classes for the native born from those for the foreign born, commonly known as "English as a second language" (ESL). We recognize that "elementary adult education" does not connote the precise intent of these classes. Perhaps the workshop can reach consensus on a more appropriate name.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Section I

A. DIFFERENTIATE MAJOR TARGET POPULATIONS FOR PURPOSES OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND REPORTING.

Each local ABE program serves a broad diversity of educationally deprived adults. Participants differ substantially in age, employment status, income level, educational attainment, ethnic background, native language, academic aptitude and place of residence. A program appropriately seeks to serve as many as possible of those who need basic educational and coping skills. The mix of participants in a program is reflected in differing rates of enrollment and retention. Some categories of potential participants are clearly better bets than others.

However, program goals also include a commitment to maintain a balance between major clientele groups. Few directors would be satisfied if their ABE participants were exclusively adults working at the seventh or eigth grade levels or for whom English is a second language.

The problem with first come-first served is that the program becomes a victim of a reverse Gresham's law: sub-populations with the highest enrollment and retention rates tend to displace other groups. This shift in clientele is most rapid when enrollment increases faster than funding. The result in many communities is that few of the least educated adults participate in ABE programs. A suggested solution is to differentiate major target groups for purposes of program development and reporting.

Specific groups within the target population to be preserved

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

as part of ABE's clientele will vary from community to community. This depends upon population characteristics and the nature of other local basic education programs. In most programs a major target sub-population is the least educated, variously referred to as hard core, most disadvantaged and poorest. Other major target groups may in some communities be high school dropouts, working mothers, unemployed men, Indians, the foreign born or others.

The process of designating target populations for major emphasis is a form of agency goal setting. This policy making process is more likely to influence practice if those who must implement the policy participate in the process and if it includes attention to both purposes and resource allocation.

One way to differentiate major target groups is to designate corresponding program areas within ABE. For instance, if local planners decide to focus on the least educated group and to devote a quarter of the ABE effort over several years to that sub-population, several decisions might follow. An internal budget might be projected for this purpose to reflect the unique requirements of recruitment, instruction and related services essential to assure optimal progression of the educationally most deprived to third grade equivalency. This would contrast with the remainder of the ABE program which may place priority on reaching the maximum number of persons with available funds.

The number of least educated adults to be served would be limited by the cost per participant. Supervisory and instructional staff for this program area, and their approache , would be selected according to the distinctive requirements of the target group within

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the context of the stated objectives. Unit cost would be relatively high; it simply will cost more to provide the more intensive, specialized and individualized service required to help the least educated adult progress than is the case for other ABE students. Because of the much more difficult task of recruiting and especially educating and retaining this group, different administrative expectations are appropriate.

A related way to differentiate major target populations is to arrange for separate categories for reporting. Most ABE directors are convinced that there is a direct connection between level of reported enrollment and the level of funding they receive. As long as enrollment is reported as a total figure, the maximizing service approach will predominate at the expense of efforts to reach the poorest or other target populations difficult to attract and retain. Differentiated reporting categories could protect programs which set priorities among target populations from being penalized for doing so.

B. MAKE TWO PARALLEL EFFORTS TO RECRUIT PARTICIPANTS ONE FOR EASIEST TO REACH, MIDDLE CLASS ORIENTED UNDEREDUCATED ADULTS, THE OTHER FOR HARDEST TO REACH, POOREST AND LEAST EDUCATED.

The characteristics of ABE's clientele partly reflect the program's recruitment and retention practices. In reality, ABE programs attempt to attract as many participants as possible with the available funds. This approach is referred to as maximizing service. In maximizing service, the middle class oriented ways of attracting participants in common use are relatively effective. Some programs also make a special

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

effort to attract a substantial number of the poorest and least educated. This approach may be referred to as reaching the poorest. There is growing evidence that adults in this target population have sufficiently different patterns of information seeking to warrant differentiated recruitment efforts.

In the "maximizing service"approach, those most readily attracted are similar to middle class adults who typically participate in adult education. Many ABE programs focus on this target population because the investment in recruitment yields more people enrolling, more persisting and more progressing faster. The standard recruitment method is word of mouth by satisfied participants. In a few ABE programs, participants are encouraged to distribute flyers, talk to groups or invite acquaintances to attend the ABE program. Fewer of the least educated know an ABE participant. Many ABE directors encourage people from employers, churches, welfare and employment agencies to refer undereducated adults to the ABE program. Fewer of the least educated take advice from other than close friends. Some directors arrange for co-sponsorship of ABE classes with employers or churches so that membership by an undereducated adult in the co-sponsoring organization facilitates entry into ABE. Fewer of the least educated are associated with formal organizations. Many directors use mass media, such as newspaper articles, radio announcements or brochures to let undereducated adults know about the ABE program. Fewer of the least educated attend to mass media for instrumental purposes, but instead use it almost exclusively for entertainment purposes.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In the "reaching the poorest" approach, different recruitment methods are needed. One of the most promising is the organization of vestibule activities in which the primary purpose is to increase readiness for ABE classes. The objective of the vestibule activity is achieved when the adult successfully begins an ABE class. Examples include vocational counseling and informal living room learning groups.

The use of recruiters has produced mixed results. In some ABE programs door-to-door recruiters produced few participants who continued in the program. In others, however, paid paraprofessionals were successful in establishing contact with potential participants who enrolled and persisted in the program. This role is similar to that of the block or street worker associated with some CAP agencies.

Another method is to relate ABE participation to programs and services in which the undereducated adult is a recipient, such as financial assistance or employment. An example is the program sponsored by the National Alliance of Businessmen. Often this results in more clearly establishing ABE participation as a step towards a tangible goal.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

C. RECOGNIZE THE DISTINCTIVE QUALITIES AND FUNCTIONS OF COMMUNITY OUTREACH AND FEEDER CLASSES; ALLOCATE RESOURCES TO MAXIMIZE THEIR EFFECTIVENESS.

A major problem in ABE is reaching the undereducated adult who is either unwilling or unable to attend class outside his own neighborhood. These individuals are often the poorest and least educated. The program's response in many cities has been to set up classes in local community facilities, such as churches and public housing projects, to "reach out" to those who would not otherwise participate. Usually, these classes are characterized by ethnic or racial homogeneity, extreme variation in achievement levels and low and precarious enrollment.

Unusual variation in student achievement level and English language facility is perhaps the most serious obstacle to the educational effectiveness of community outreach classes. A common problem in ABE, it is exacerbated in outreach locations where it is not possible to separate students on the basis of achievement level. Even the best teachers find it difficult to deal with a class composed of students with widely varying backgrounds and needs. Under these conditions, classroom learning could be significantly enhanced by instruction on a small group and individual basis. Consequently, community outreach classes should be given high priority in the assignment of aides and volunteers to provide the necessary assistance.

There has been a continuing debate about the relative advantages and disadvantages of community outreach classes. Advantages of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

outreach classes include: 1) extension of ABE opportunities to the hardest to reach and most disadvantaged portion of the target population; 2) a learning environment enhanced by the social cohesion that results from common membership in a church or other organization; and 3) greater visibility for ABE in the community and broader community support. Among the disadvantages are: 1) higher per student cost; 2) problems of coordination and logistics; 3) poor facilities; 4) lack of instructional equipment and a wide choice of materials; 5) lack of means to group students by achievement level; and 6) difficulty in providing counseling services.

Whether advantages outweigh disadvantages depends in large measure on local community conditions and the goals and educational philosophy of the local director and his staff. One seldom used strategy to exploit advantages and to minimize disadvantages of outreach classes is to establish them as temporary feeder classes to channel students to better equipped centralized locations after initial fears, misunderstanding about the program, and other sources of resistance are overcome. This would entail a major emphasis on program orientation and counseling and would require recruitment of teachers with very special abilities.

There is also need for a different kind of feeder class to serve centralized, multi-class sites. Evidence from interviews with students and teachers suggests that continuous enrollment of new students is seriously detrimental to effective teaching and learning. New students require an inordinate amount of the teacher's time. Moreover, new students are seldom screened carefully and are often

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

inappropriately placed in a class compounding the problem. It is probable that latecomers often fail to catch up with the class, become discouraged, and drop out at a disproportionate rate. These problems could be substantially mitigated by establishing a feeder class for late enrollees. The feeder class would enable accurate assessment of achievement level (or ability to speak English) as the basis for placement in an ongoing class at an appropriate time. It could also provide much-needed counseling and program orientation for latecomers. Because of student heterogeneity in achievement level and the need for intensive individual attention, priority in assignment of aides and volunteers should be given to these classes.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EXPLOIT ADVANTAGES OF CO-SPONSORSHIP AND DEVELOP EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES FOR INITIATING AND SUSTAINING CO-SPONSOR LINKAGES.

A co-sponsor is any organization or agency that provides enough members or employees to justify an ABE class. It may also furnish space for the class to meet. A co-sponsor can be a small membership organization, such as a church or community group, a large employer such as an industrial plant or hospital or a "total" institutional environment, for example a prison or nursing home.

Co-sponsorship is a potentially effective way to recruit participants and expand the ABE program. It also serves to extend ABE into the community and to reach many who might otherwise not participate. A significant educational advantage in many co-sponsored classes is greater group cohesion and support among participants. Educational achievement is likely to be greater in classes co-sponsored by employers in which there are external incentives and common or similar goals among participants. There may be substantial savings for the ABE program when the co-sponsor provides classroom space; occasionall large employers will also furnish funds for materials and instructional equipment. Increased visibility in the community and a potentially potent organizational constituency to voice community support for ABE are additional advantages.

The principal disadvantage of co-sponsorship is the substantial time and effort usually required to initiate and sustain the relationship. Not only are preliminary arrangements time consuming, but maintaining the relationship can be a formidable task requiring some diplomatic skill, particularly if problems develop between teachers and co-sponsors.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Maintaining enrollment can also be a problem, particularly when dealing with small community organizations such as churches and CAP agencies. When the co-sponsor is a large employer, such as a hospital or industry, it can be difficult to ensure uninterrupted class time or a permanent meeting place.

Many problems can be avoided or minimized if certain strategies are employed in the initial planning stage. For example, it is usually advantageous to negotiate agreements with high ranking personnel in the co-sponsoring organization, particularly if it is a large, bureaucratic organization such as a hospital, industrial firm, or governmental agency. Approval by high ranking officials generally results in greater cooperation from operational level personnel, greater recognition of ABE, minimization of red tape and elimination of delay necessitated by going up the chain of command.

It can also be helpful in initial planning with the co-sponsor to involve personnel at various levels in the organization who will have contact with ABE participants and staff. Teachers should also be included. When participation in planning is not feasible, it is vitally important that details of the arrangement be communicated to teachers and relevant co-sponsor personnel. Consideration might also be given to including in the planning representatives of the adults who will participate in ABE. This may not be feasible--or acceptable--when the co-sponsor is a large employer, but it is often practicable when planning classes with indigenous community organizations. Involving participants is one way to ensure the relevance of ABE to their needs and interests and of fostering commitment to the program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The co-sponsor's active support can also be crucial to ABE's success. Co-sponsoring organizations should be urged to provide special incentives and rewards for members or employees who participate in ABE. A highly desirable but exceptional example is paid released time to attend class. Also desirable and exceptional is a commitment by the employer to consider successful "graduates" for job promotions. Even modest incentives or sanctions can be helpful. For example, ABE can be given visibility and prestige by a public statement of company recognition or a newsletter announcement. Leaders of community organizations can promote a positive image of ABE by stressing the special status of participants and the accomplishment of completing the program.

It appears that large, highly centralized ABE programs closely tied to the public school structure are more likely to enter into co-sponsor relationships with other large bureaucratic organizations. This seems to be the case in larger cities, but size is not the only determinant. Another is program philosophy, specifically emphasis on community uplift or on more traditional educational values. Programs with a community uplift or social welfare orientation in large cities tend to be characterized by a more flexible decentralized structure. They tend to seek co-sponsorship with small community organizations. The most flexible and least highly structured programs tend to be in smaller cities. They are more oriented to the community than to the public schools and traditional public school educational values. They usually more effectively seek co-sponsorship with such local organizations as churches, neighborhood associations and CAP agencies. The general pattern, with many exceptions, is to relate to co-sponsors similar in size and organizational structure to the ABE program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This is not always desirable, but exceptions may be difficult to initiate and sustain. For example, co-sponsorship between a small community oriented program and a very large organization can require so great a commitment of staff time and program resources as to reduce program flexibility and deflect the program from its original goals. Conversely, large centralized programs often lack sufficient flexibility to create linkages with small community organizations, each involving special requirements. One way to cope with this limitation is to establish a community liaison role within the program expressly charged with fostering and developing co-sponsorship with community organizations.

Community liaison requires specialized knowledge of the target community, personal acceptability there and skill in dealing effectively with people. The most desirable liaison persons are individuals whose primary occupations or former occupations complement the liaison role, such as welfare aides, ministers or teachers. It is of great advantage if liaison staff have roots or extensive contacts in the target community. Persons with backgrounds in complementary occupations are more likely to be skilled in working with people and familiar with the culture and problems of the community. They are not only "pre-trained," but if employed part-time are often able to do ABE liaison work in the in the course of their regular employment.

It is important that the liaison role be carefully defined and responsibilities spelled out. When this is not done, liaison staff tend to devote most of their time to other assignments required of them.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

An important component of the liaison role that requires greater emphasis is feedback and evaluation. Often the director has little knowledge of what is going on in outreach classes. Liaison staff can provide valuable feedback on such matters as relevance of classes to community needs and teacher competency. Provision should also be made for coordination between liaison staff, teachers and counselors, particularly in matters related to community feedback, student recruitment and student retention.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Section II

A. RECOGNIZE MAJOR DYNAMICS OF THE ABE CLASSROOM ASIDE FROM AIDING CONTENT MASTERY TO IMPROVE TEACHER PERFORMANCE.

Common patterns of classroom dynamics constitute important qualitative norms for the identification of staff development needs, supervision and assessment of teacher performance.

Major determinants which shape classroom interaction include the ubiquitous administrative pressure felt by the teacher to maintain attendance, absence of extrinsic incentives to deter dropouts, extreme diversity among students including their objectives (a better job, passing a Civil Service test, getting a driver's license, helping children do school work, socialization, passing the time, therapy) and distinctive characteristics of educationally disadvantaged adults (fear and expectation of failure, easily offended, limited energy and attention span, lack of skill in how to learn, varied conceptions of time and punctuality, etc.)

These factors produce a situation in which there is seldom formation of true groups which can be used to foster learning through shared experience, to evolve shared values and to support attitudinal change. The process of socialization is attenuated. ABE is also distinguished by a markedly relaxed set of classroom rules and conventions - late arrivals, early departures, sleeping, chatting, wandering; atmosphere is permissive, friendly, informal. In many classes effectiveness of instruction will be a function of how well custodial, social, "park bench" and social service functions are carried out.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

As students can enroll anytime, usually with little or no screening, there is a major problem of accomodating late starters and returning absentees. Students do not compete with each other and are almost never permitted to fail - mistakes are handled by a wide variety of tactics: prompting, permitting delayed responses, redefining the task into simple components, rephrasing a troublesome question, giving an easier alternative assignment and many others. Teachers avoid or delay testing, blur benchmarks of progress, coach students for tests and emphasize their non-judgmental nature. Skill in failure management is important to teacher performance.

Possibilities open to the ABE teacher to control student attention and classroom disruptions are limited primarily to the use of banter, generalized injunctions to the class and looking the other way. Direct commands and other situations which may force a confrontation are avoided. Attempts to control the inattentive or mildly disruptive are usually counterproductive.

Instructional methods and content are heavily laden with the crust of elementary school tradition of present-recite/test-correct. The modal pattern involves a teacher presentation or assignment followed in ESL by class level drill, dialogue or especially solicited or required individual response. In EAE students are taught more frequently on an individual level. Teachers infrequently use small learning groups; practice and recitation are common small group functions when used. Teachers attend to the "middle" range of students and hope to deal with others on an individual basis. Marked attrition in attendance of slower and more advanced students results.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In single class sites heterogeneity makes individualization of instruction essential.

Instruction is individualized in ABE most commonly while a class is working on a problem or individual assignments. It is accomplished by either seeking out those who have trouble and want help or by walking up and down aisles and either stopping at each desk in turn or responding to requests for attention.

Three innovative patterns of instruction have been identified. One is that of the learning laboratory in which students are tested and an individual work plan is prescribed. The student comes in at his own convenience and pursues his assignments by individual self-instruction aided by reading machines and other learning devices. He may request tutorial help as he needs it from a teacher in attendance. The student is periodically retested and his work plan reformulated. There is usually poor communication between the lab and classroom teachers in the program; probably teachers should rotate between lab and classroom. For most students some combination of lab with small group instruction is best, perhaps with increasing proportion of time devoted to lab work as they advance.

Another promising approach lets the participants in a class dictate the order and pace of covering desired content rather than following a logical order of presenting topics as determined by the teacher or materials writer. Major concepts are covered in an order determined by student involvement in defining problems, illustrating concepts and testing meanings in their personal experience. Class interaction determines speed with which there is movement from topic to topic and in what order this is done.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A third pattern involves the teacher giving different assignments to small groups, some groups working with more or less difficult materials, and the teacher acting as a resource person and multi-group member. Students select which group they wish to go into. Friends are encouraged to stay together and there is much socializing within groups. Individuals are encouraged and expected to complete their own assignments and have freedom to "do their own thing" as long as they do not create disturbances. The use of learning groups is of potential value for fostering attitude change. Use of discussion as an instructional method is rare in ABE; where used it usually evokes interest and involvement.

The value of interpreting abstract ideas in terms relevant to the lives of ABE students has wide acceptance in theory, but little planning is done for such effort. Important "latent lessons" are learned without being taught: education as dysfunctional or as the high road to mobility and success, phased progression to a goal, self-directedness in learning, industriousness, etc. Students are almost never involved in any aspect of program planning or evaluation; they vote with their feet.

Content is influenced by the GED and other tests, especially in intermediate and advanced classes, which are the most frequently found in the program. Serious students, especially at these levels seek benchmarks of progress and welcome confidential test results. Testing is primarily a threat to beginning students. Health, consumer, family life and civic education and "coping" skills are taught only incidentally and almost never included in tests. Teachers seldom prepare their own materials, but are eclectic in using what is available; programmed materials are not popular.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Paraprofessionals are used in clerical work, administration, housekeeping, child care, recruiting and instruction. Underlying functions are assuming work overload, distasteful work, low-valued work, sharing of work, counseling and rescuing students and teachers from each other. Aides should be able and willing jacks-of-all trades. Paraprofessionals have special value in coping with teachers' major problems of attendance maintenance (by recruiting, contacting absentees and baby sitting) and heterogeneity (by instructing sub-groups and individuals) and students' major problem of the continuing interruption of newcomers into the class, (by teaching beginners).

In assessing the need for paraprofessionals to share teaching functions, priority should be given to teachers who have heterogenous classes with a wide range of achievement, involving instruction at several levels and subjects, and who teach sub-groups within a class and individualize instruction. These conditions are more apt to pertain to classes in decentralized locations and in EAF rather than ESL. Effective use of an aide for instruction will be in part a function of how the teacher allocates her time between class, sub-groups and individuals and her pace of alternating among them. Instruction must be organized to optimally use the time of the aide in instruction.

To foster teacher-aide "fit" the teacher should be permitted to choose from among several candidates and trial periods should be planned. Experienced aides should not be transferred unless necessary because of lack of "fit" or otherwise essential.

Factors relevant to the success of volunteers include amount of time for service, prior training, teacher willingness to supervise and instruct, knowledge of native language of students,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

disposition to accept teacher's authority, warmth and empathy; many of these factors also pertain to paid aides.

B. ENCOURAGE PREPARATION OF SHORT TERM INSTRUCTIONAL UNITS WHICH PROVIDE FEEDBACK ON LEARNER PROGRESS TOWARD THEIR GOALS.

"Individualized instruction" is widely misconstrued to mean individualized prescriptions to meet program rather than learner goals. Many participants come to acquire specific skills for specific purposes but are shoehorned into a program oriented toward eighth grade or high school equivalency. Getting a driver's license or passing a specific civil service test requires specialized content and effort. Short-term goals should be legitimized and instruction modified accordingly.

Significant inclusion of education in urban living - consumer health, family life, human relations, civic education as well as "coping" skills will be effected only if deliberate effort is made to set aside time for instruction. This is not being done in the ABE program. Resources must be allocated to appropriate curricula, materials and methods and ABE teachers and aides trained and encouraged in their use. Instruction in these areas is typically incidental and unsystematic. Content and skills involved are beyond the experience of most ABE teachers. If more emphasis is to be put on content other than the 3 R's, federal guidelines should be made more specific and funds locally allocated for curriculum development. Otherwise, the program will be found wanting in evaluating progress toward meeting these implied ambiguous objectives. "Education for

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

urban living" must be defined in realistic short-term program intentions if it is meant to be more than rhetoric.

Short-term participant goals are important. Many enroll with only vague notions of what the program has to offer and with unrealistic expectations of the time needed to reach their goals. Their objectives must often be reformulated in terms of a series of realistic, progressive, short-term objectives. Greater emphasis is required on orientation and counseling new and prospective participants. A majority come for job related reasons; a vigorous program of vocational counseling and job placement will significantly increase enrollment and reduce dropouts. Referral to public employment agencies has proven inadequate to the needs of this particular group. A record of job placement and achievement of other short-term goals represents a tangible benefit of advantage in building program support.

Because participants often are unclear about what the program can offer them and the time and effort required to meet their goals, once over their initial fears they require continuous private feedback of their short-term performance. For those who wish it, results of achievement tests should be included. This especially applies to participants in intermediate and advanced levels of instruction. Although new or beginning participants may require strong and continuing encouragement to offset fear of failure, the more advanced want to know how they are doing in relation to their goals. Those unable to "locate" themselves are often discouraged and confused.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

C. INCORPORATE SYSTEMATIC ANALYSIS OF QUALITATIVE FACTORS IN PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION.

To improve program practice it is essential that planners have a dependable normative description of ABE program practice, classroom interaction and the perspectives of those involved. Both modal and innovative patterns should be included in this description. In the absence of such qualitative benchmarks, measurement techniques are frequently indiscriminately used to measure only those aspects of program development most amenable to measurement. Qualitative factors of evolving interaction - critical to program success - are often ignored. "Objectives" or program intents are seldom modified by evaluators to reflect subsequent realities of implementation. "Instruments" are devised to study often arbitrarily selected aspects of the program displacing less tangible objectives. How and by whom shall crucial questions of the priority and order of program consequences be decided? This is usually quite arbitrarily done by the external evaluator. Preoccupation with program "output" mitigates against needed assessment of the development of organizational capability to mount and sustain ABE programs.

Administrators need a management information system which encompasses qualitative factors in program development. Their internal operational analyses should involve a continuous flow of comparative data on classroom interaction and on how students and teachers see the program and themselves in relation to it. From such data common problems could be identified, policy and program priorities soundly established, staff development planned with dependable

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

knowledge of current classroom practice and innovations identified. When combined with evaluative measurement of program outcome, the administrator would know not only whether his program is producing gains but why - and how to improve them.

How methods of qualitative analysis demonstrated by the national ABE study conducted by the Center for Adult Education at Teachers College might be adapted for use by an administrator in his own urban program deserves careful study by directors and professors of adult education.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Section III

A. RECOGNIZE THE INTERRELATEDNESS OF INSTRUCTIONAL ROLES AND UTILIZE PARAPROFESSIONALS AND COUNSELORS TO OPTIMIZE INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS.

ABE is unique in the autonomy of the classroom teacher to choose teaching strategies and curriculum materials and to plan program content. The success of the teacher, nevertheless, is largely dependent on the support of administrators, counselors, and, in some programs, paraprofessionals and volunteers.

Paraprofessionals and Volunteers

The interdependence of instructional roles is most evident in the relationship between the teacher and the paid or unpaid aide. The paraprofessional can perform instructional tasks with individuals or small groups, or he can relieve the teacher of non-instructional chores so that more time may be devoted to participants. In addition, aides can assist with recruitment and follow up on absentees. They may also conduct a "feeder" section of the class so that incoming adults will not interrupt the instruction of other participants. In one instance observed, paraprofessionals were used as babysitters so that the adults could attend class.

Where the teacher and the participants come from different cultural or racial backgrounds, the aide who shares the participants' cultural perspectives can act as bridge between the students and the ABE program. Although administrators often voice their approval of this paraprofessional role, most programs seem to de-emphasize this function in practice. The most salient day-to-day concern is fitting the paraprofessional to the teacher's classroom style. Moreover, the role of bridge to the community is difficult for the aide, who must balance his

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

loyalty to the program and to the participants. Particularly in classes where participants and aide speak a language the teacher does not understand, there is the possibility of friction--especially when the aide sees himself as an advocate for the participants.

The precise role the aide plays in any one classroom is determined in varying measure by state laws and local regulations, the expectations of local ABE administrators, the style of the teacher in the classroom, the source of funding for paid aides, the demands of students, and the desires of the aide himself. The most important determinant is probably the teacher's style. Aides are most often productively used in instructional roles when the teacher organizes his class into small groups or individual units. Reliance on instruction involving the class as a whole often relegates the aide to a clerical role. It may be useful, therefore, to encourage teachers who can organize a classroom into small learning groups to teach the more heterogeneous classes found in single class sites and to provide them with instructional aides.

Unpaid volunteers often come to the program with higher levels of education than do paid paraprofessionals, who are often recruited from the same community as the target population. This characteristic of the volunteer accounts in part for the greater use of volunteers in purely instructional roles than is the case with paid aides. Moreover, because the paid aide depends on salary provided by the program, he is less likely than the volunteer to leave when dissatisfied. Consequently, teachers have more leverage in assigning tasks to the paid paraprofessional. Where paid aides and volunteers are used in the same classroom, the volunteer is more likely to fill a tutorial role while the aide may be assigned clerical duties. Administrators should be aware of this tendency when they assign aides to the classroom.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The expectations of the ABE administration are important determinants of the aide's role. Some formalization of paraprofessional roles is useful administratively and encourages efficient use of aide time; too much formalization or specification of aide functions, however, will restrict the aide's usefulness to the teacher and may preclude the development of a compatible working relationship between teacher and aide.

An effective working relationship in the classroom is crucial to the productive use of the aide but difficult to achieve. Some administrators have successfully dealt with this problem by individually placing each aide with a compatible teacher. Alternatively, teachers could be permitted to choose aides from among several candidates. The "fit" of aide and teacher can be influenced by pre-service or in-service training for both. Most teachers who work with aides express a desire for better pre-service preparation for the paraprofessional. A pre-service training program can extend the range of roles the aide is capable of assuming while screening out clearly unsuitable candidates. If pre-service training accustoms the aide to a particular teaching style, however, it may lead to friction with a teacher whose methods conflict with the aide's expectations. The importance of on-the-job training in cooperation with the teacher is thus indicated.

In-service training can equally assist the teacher to modify teaching techniques to use aides more efficiently and to view the aide more as a member of the professional staff than as a subordinate.

Counselors

Teachers and counselors share responsibility for acclimating the ABE participant to the instructional program, helping him define his

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

particular instructional needs and assisting him to apply his education to the environment beyond the classroom. There is a lack of consensus among professionals as to the most effective role for counselors in these tasks. Some counselors do little else but testing. Others are prodded by supervisors who believe that "coping is the name of the game" and that counselors should concentrate on helping participants deal with the power structure. Counselors may screen participants and place them in classes, test them do job placement, make referrals to social service and health agencies and counsel on a variety of educational, vocational and personal problems. They may also arrange for speakers from such agencies as the League of Women Voters, a bureau of consumer frauds or the city housing authority. One demonstration project reported good results with regularly scheduled group counseling sessions, but in a setting radically different from the typical ABE program.

Many enroll in ABE classes with only vague notions of what the program has to offer and with unrealistic expectations of the time needed to reach their goals. One can expect that retention and participant performance will be increased by greater program emphasis on orientation and counseling of new participants. Those at intermediate and advanced levels are particularly likely to benefit from continuous private feedback on their performance, including results of achievement tests. Although participants--particularly new enrollees--often need strong and continuing encouragement to offset fears of failure, most want to know how well they are doing in relation to their goals. Those unable to "locate" themselves are often discouraged and confused.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Participants are likely to consult counselors about educational or vocational problems, but rarely ask assistance with more personal difficulties. It is often the case that counselors are white and the ABE participants black or from another ethnic minority. This difference may limit communication between student and counselor. In fact, the teacher is more likely to develop a familiarity with the out-of-school life of the participant; the counselor may see a participant no more than once or twice during the year.

Problems relating to health, jobs, housing and family life probably affect dropout rates as much or more than inadequacies in the program itself. Assistance is clearly needed to at least deal with those social problems amenable to change. Some argue that the counselor should be involved as little as possible with academic concerns but should help participants solve the problems that inhibit efficient participation in the ABE class. Where counselor availability is limited, however, and teachers are better able to understand participants' out-of-school problems, there are obvious implications for greater teacher involvement in the counseling process.

Teachers often do not have time to familiarize themselvers with various social service and health resources in their participants' communities. Perhaps the counselor's role in many programs could become one of resource trainer and backstopper for the classroom teacher, making it possible for the teacher to more effectively assume the counseling function.

Most ABE participants are motivated to attend class to change their job status. This suggests the need to develop vocational counseling and job placement competencies in the ABE program, either through direct contacts with employers or through cultivated linkages with state or city

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

job placement or training programs. The heavy reliance of ABE programs on word-of-mouth for recruitment also argues for improving job placement capabilities. Word of mouth operates with special effectiveness when the prospective participant learns that others have obtained jobs as a result of their ABE experience. There is also good likelihood that the addition of counselors for vocational advisement and placement would reduce ABE's drop-out rate.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

B. ALLOCATE MORE RESOURCES FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT DESIGNED TO DEAL WITH INSTRUCTION AND CLASSROOM INTERACTION AS IT EXISTS IN REALITY.

Teacher performance will be most enhanced by training which focuses upon analysis of actual classroom performance with opportunity for practice and feedback in specific skill areas identified in this study. ABE teachers need guided practice in personalizing abstract ideas, using learning groups, discussion and other methods of adult education to evoke student involvement. How to involve and motivate in the first and early meetings, ask questions, teach "coping" skills (including those involved in learning), prepare instructional materials and innovate in various instructional approaches are training priorities. Video tapes of ABE classroom instruction can be invaluable for teachers to learn to analyze commonalities and variations in the organization of instruction, of methods of mediating content with learner experience, patter social interaction, and the mechanisms of failure management and control. "Understanding the student population" should consist less of generalized insights about the culture of poverty from the literature and more of inquiry arising out of observed classroom behavior.

Teachers and paraprofessionals should be trained for complementarity -- teachers how to organize instruction to optimally use paraprofessionals, paraprofessionals how to perform functions to fit into the plan. Both should become familiar with alternative ways of organizing instruction and aides should be trained to assume appropriate roles as different styles of teaching are encountered.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Many training programs for aides are inadequate because they tend to establish a single model for aide performance when there is great variety in teacher styles requiring different mixes of roles on the part of paraprofessionals. Paraprofessionals should be trained as-jacks-of-all trades to assure flexibility. Again, video taped classroom operations illustrating how an aide functions in various situations and field observation can be useful. Pre-service training can usefully include orientation to ABE and the schools, participant needs, materials and equipment and a frank discussion of common problems. A special effort should be made to build spirit and enthusiasm for work in the program. Training should be subsequently developed around common problems encountered by aides in their work. It should be continuous and the process should involve supervisors and experienced teachers. Whenever possible, this should include the teacher with whom the aide is working.

The system should provide for upward mobility by which paraprofessionals can aspire and work to become qualified ABE teachers. There should also be provision for salary increments and other incentives for those who wish to remain aides and prove to be valuable in these positions. In the absence of such provisions morale is damaged and those hired as links to the local community tend to build a separate ideology predicated upon their sense of closeness and sensitivity to the point of view of students and their greater capacity to understand and relate to them - sometimes at the expense of the teacher's relatioship with students. These aides can perform

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

as vital communications links with students only if they do not alienate the teacher by being competitive for student approval and serving in the role of their advocate. This problem should be worked through insofar as possible in the training of aides.

Paid and especially unpaid paraprofessionals should have their positions formalized with identification cards, certificates of completion of training, formal application procedures, interviews and the amenities extended to teachers. These are often neglected to the detriment of morale.

Continuing in-service training - with released time - for teachers, supervisors and counselors should be specifically related to the distinctive problems of ABE and its participants. Staff development teams involving master teachers and instructional supervisors could prove useful. In multi-class sites, the master teacher, with a lightened teaching load, could perform in an instructional supervisory role, freeing regular supervisors to give more attention to decentralized classes.

Training of ABE teachers will be improved and the program professionalized by the collaborative development by professors of adult education and ABE professionals of university programs with special emphasis on supervised field experience. There should be built-in salary, time in lieu of teaching, or employment preference incentives for teachers to participate. The program should be related to on-going in-service training conducted by the various school districts. Universities should develop continuing training, consultation, demonstration, materials development, action research

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and operational analysis services for local ABE programs through cooperative contracts with several districts. Such an arrangement might be established on a demonstration basis with Title III,Section 309 funds to test its value and with states or cities agreeing to assume increasing proportions of the cost as direct federal support is phased out over time.

Staff development might also include assignment of experienced teachers to a curriculum development team to develop materials in lieu of teaching assignments.

There is a reluctance by many ABE directors to release teachers from classroom duty for training and materials development assignments. The rationalization is that doing so would "rob the students." But our research reveals high dropout rates, the prevalence of dysfunctional teaching methods and styles and a dearth of relevant instructional materials. In no other program in the public schools is there greater need to professionalize instruction by making it functional and relevant to the needs of a specialized student body. Teachers, the organization of instruction, teaching methods, curricula and instructional materials are all borrowed with little adaptation from programs designed for a totally different population. Directors are penny wise and pound foolish to resist allocating resources for staff development.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

C. PERIODICALLY REVIEW INNOVATIVE PROGRAM PRACTICES AND SYSTEMATICALLY INCORPORATE THE MOST PROMISING.

The institutional marginality of ABE and the over-extension of resources in the effort to maximize service are major factors that inhibit development of innovative program practices. Moreover, innovation in ABE tends to occur in isolation. Teachers have little detailed familiarity with effective practices in other classrooms. Directors have limited knowledge of effective program practices in other cities. During this period of consolidation following their initial growth period, federally supported ABE programs need systematic procedures to identify innovative practices and to institutionalize the most effective.

Many of the most promising innovative practices are found in relatively few cities. Paradoxically, practices found innovative and effective in some cities have been tried and abandoned by others. Examples of innovative practices include:

- Co-sponsorship of ABE classes in which the co-sponsor makes a substantial input toward achieving objectives.
- Inclusion in the local school budget of a financial cushion to minimize problems related to delay in receipt of federal funds.
- Operation of a large ABE facility to provide comprehensive program offerings and related services.
- Individualization of instruction, including the use of learning groups and learning laboratory equipment and materials.
- Preparation and circulation of evaluations of new materials.
- Selective and effective use of trained paraprofessionals.
- Employment of liaison staff to facilitate linkage with community groups.

The following procedures constitute a strategy that a director

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

might use to incorporate effective innovative practices in his ABE program as part of a process of planned change.

- Monitor innovations. Some innovations are reported in publications of the ERIC Adult Education Clearinghouse, of associations such as NAPCAE and AEA and in reports and reviews of demonstration projects. Innovations may be discovered by visits to classrooms and to programs in other cities. Establish procedures by which the director and some of his staff regularly identify innovations.

- Select promising innovations. Only a few can be incorporated at any one time. The ABE staff should periodically screen innovations that have been identified to select a few which would seem to make the greatest contribution to the local program.

- Explore experience. Assume or assign the responsibility for securing detailed information about how the practice developed and is working elsewhere. Include analysis of both the dynamics of its operation and factors facilitating and inhibiting its development. Anticipate whether these or other factors would pertain to its introduction and development in your program.

- Test practice. Most practices require adaptation if they are to succeed in a different situation. This is facilitated by a limited local trial with extensive evaluation.

- Facilitate adoption. Provide incentives. In addition to time off and extra pay, facilitators could include staff assistance, extra materials, travel funds and recognition for implementing an innovation.

- Institutionalization. Make provision for standardizing the practice by fostering a commitment to its long term use by those on whom its continuation will depend.

- Report results. Fulfill professional responsibilities to the field by reporting results of efforts to incorporate innovative practices--both positive and negative. You will be helping colleagues and the field to move out of the stage of inventing the wheel over and over again. Reports can be disseminated through publications and association meetings.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In assessing innovative practices in a demonstration project, it is important to recognize that not all demonstrations are pilot projects. Demonstration projects often are designed to develop new practices for "the field;" the objective is to establish the advantage of specific practices which may be replicated, although the project itself is not suitable for replication or for incorporation as an integral part of an on-going program. A pilot-type demonstration project is meant to be incorporated into the regular program. There are distinct advantages to developing pilot projects within the context of existing programs rather than to staff and organize them outside established organizational structure and procedures. Many ABE programs have found it difficult to incorporate demonstration projects into their regular operations.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY TEACHERS COLLEGE
Center for Adult Education
New York, New York 10027

STUDY OF URBAN PUBLIC SCHOOL

ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

Conducted
by

ABE in the Inner City Project
Center for Adult Education

Teachers College Columbia University

Director
Jack D. Mezirow

Associate Director
Alan B. Knox

The work presented herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Grant Number
OEG 0-9-422163-441(324)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Instructions

This questionnaire is part of a large scale study of urban public school ABE. The purpose of the study is to disseminate information that will be useful to decision-makers like yourself in program development and evaluation. We are asking you to share your ideas and experience with others by completing this questionnaire and returning it in the enclosed envelope.

A few points of clarification . . .

In this questionnaire, "ABE unit" refers to the unit or program financed by federal Title III monies. If you are responsible for other ABE-type programs (e.g., WIN), try to distinguish the other programs from Title III in responding to this questionnaire. If students in other programs attend Title III classes, then the program is considered to be Title III for our purposes.

Unless otherwise specified, the information requested is for the 1969-1970 fiscal year.

Some questions ask for figures or percentages. If the data are not readily available, estimate as best you can. This questionnaire should take about 30 minutes to complete. Please do not spend undue time consulting your files.

Feel free to write your response in your own words if the forced choice options do not fit your situation.

Your responses will be kept strictly confidential. No program will be identified in any publication or report.

Your contribution to this study is important and sincerely appreciated.

Sample Items

CHECKMARKS: Place checkmark in the parenthesis after the appropriate answer. Unless otherwise specified, make a checkmark in one space only.

Sample #1

Is there a Title III ABE program in your city?

Yes 2(✓)

No 1( )

SCALES: Circle one number only. If a question contains more than one scale, circle one number in each scale.

Sample #2

Rate the influence of the following on ABE legislation.

	Little influence						Great influence
HEW Dept.	1	2	3	4	5	(6)	7
Publishing Lobby	1	2	(3)	4	5	6	7

ESTIMATES: Some questions ask for estimates of figures. Write your estimate in the space provided.

Sample #3

What is your total ABE enrollment? 650

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

History of ABE Unit

CARD ONE

1. Was there a program of adult basic education (aside from Americanization classes) in your school system prior to the appropriation of federal funds for ABE in 1965? Yes 2( ) No 1( ) — 11

2. When federal funds became available, what was the response of your school system?

Established ABE classes for first time . . . . . 1( ) — 12

Expanded existing ABE program . . . . . 2( )

Established separate, parallel ABE program with federal funds . . . . 3( )

Other (specify)_____ 4( )

Organization Administration

3. To whom do you officially report?

Director of adult education . . . . . 1( ) — 13

Assistant or deputy superintendent . . . . . 2( )

Superintendent . . . . . 3( )

Other (specify)_____ 4( )

4. Are you responsible for all ABE or similar programs (e.g., WIN) administered by your school system? Yes 2( ) No 1( ) — 14

5. (If no), list those <u>not</u> under your supervision.

_____

6. Does your ABE program include English as a second language classes (separate from Americanization)? Yes 2( ) No 1( ) — 16

7. Are you responsible for adult or vocational programs <u>other than</u> ABE? Yes 2( ) No 1( ) — 17

8. (If yes), check those under your supervision.

High school . . . . . ( ) — 18

Vocational education . . . . . ( ) — 19

General adult education . . . . . ( ) — 20

Other (specify)_____( ) — 21

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

9. (If you are responsible for adult education programs in addition to ABE), what proportion of your time do you devote to the ABE program?

0% 100%

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 ( ) 22

10. Do teachers-in-charge, principals, or other supervisors with ABE responsibilities report to you? Yes 2( ) 23

No 1( )

11. (If yes), how many are full and how many part-time?

Full-time____ ( ) 24

Part-time____ ( ) 25

12. To what degree do you rely on informally negotiated arrangements and contacts with key school system personnel to keep the ABE unit functioning?

Little or no degree — Great degree

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ( ) 26

13. How would you describe the influence of the following in determining your ABE instructional goals?

	Little or no influence						Great influence	
Yourself	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	27
State ABE plan	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	28
Teachers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	29
Supervisory staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	30
State ABE staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	31
ABE students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	32
Counselors	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	33

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Community

14. How would you describe public awareness of ABE in your city?

Little or no awareness						Great awareness	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	( ) 34

15. What is the general public image of ABE in your city?

Highly positive . . . . . 5( )

Mildly positive . . . . . 4( )

Mildly negative . . . . . 3( )

Highly negative . . . . . 2( )

Don't know . . . . . .1( )

16. What is the maximum total number of adults in your city or service area who need ABE? (your target population)

_____ ( ) 36
( ) 37
( ) 38

17. About how many classes does your ABE program co-sponsor with each of the following organizations or agencies? (write in number)

Churches . . . . . _____ ( ) 39

Hospitals . . . . . _____ ( ) 40

Businesses . . . . . _____ ( ) 41

CAP agencies . . . . . _____ ( ) 42

Non-CAP community orgs. . _____ ( ) 43

Manpower training orgs. . _____ ( ) 44

Other (specify)_____ ( ) 45

_____

18. What organizations in your city sponsor separate ABE programs?

Churches . . . . . ( ) 46

Hospitals . . . . . ( ) 47

Businesses . . . . . ( ) 48

CAP agencies . . . . . ( ) 49

Non-CAP community organizations . . . . . ( ) 50

Community colleges . . . . . ( ) 51

Other (specify)_____ ( ) 52

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

19. To what degree is there competition for students between your ABE program and other ABE programs?

Little or no degree						Great degree	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	53

20. With which of the following agencies does your ABE program make or receive referrals of participants?

Welfare	( )	54
Employment	( )	55
Manpower training	( )	56
CAP agencies	( )	57
Non-CAP community organizations . . .	( )	58
Other (specify)_____		
_____	( )	59

Administrative-Supervisory Staff

21. Approximately what proportion of your ABE supervisory personnel (teachers-in-charge, principals, supervisors, etc.) were recruited from within the school system?

0% 100%

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 ( ) 60

22. About what proportion of your ABE administrative-supervisory staff have had experience as teachers or counselors in ABE?

0% 100%

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 ( ) 61

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

23 What is the most probable next promotion for an ABE director or coordinator in your school system? (check one)

Assistant superintendent	1( )	62
Principal (non adult education)	2( )	
Assistant principal (non adult education)	3( )	
Director of adult education	4( )	
Adult education principal	5( )	
Other (specify)_____	6( )	

24. (If employed full-time), is your current salary roughly equivalent to that of

Assistant superintendent	1( )	63
Principal	2( )	
Assistant principal	3( )	
Other (specify)_____	4( )	

Instructional Staff

25. What is the total number of full-time and part-time ABE teachers in your program?

	( ) 64
Full-time_____	( ) 65
	( ) 66
Part-time_____	( ) 67
	( ) 68

26. (If you employ full-time ABE teachers), what is their employment status?

No contract -- paid by the hour	1( )	69
Substitute or other provisional status	2( )	
Same status as other teachers in system	3( )	

27. Approximately what proportion of all ABE teachers in your program have backgrounds in elementary education?

0% 100%

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 ( ) 70

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

28. Approximately what proportion of part-time ABE teachers are employed full-time during the day as teachers or counselors in the school system?

0% 100%

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 ( ) 71

29. Do you employ paraprofessionals in your ABE program? Yes 2( ) 72

No 1( )

30. (If paraprofessionals are employed), how many serve in each of the following capacities?

Teacher aide or assistant____ ( ) 73

Teachers ____ ( ) 74

Clerical aide ____ ( ) 75

Recruiter ____ ( ) 76

Other (specify)_____

_____ ( ) 77

31. How much freedom do you have in selecting teachers for your ABE program?

Little or no freedom						Great freedom	CARD TWO
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	11

32. How important are the following factors in the decision to hire an ABE teacher?

	Not Important					Very Important		
Previous experience teaching adults . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	12
Commitment to ABE goals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	13
Coursework in adult education	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	14
Elementary education experience	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	15
Racial or ethnic background similar to ABE target population	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	16
Personality traits judged desirable in an ABE teacher	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	17

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

33. Are ABE teachers <u>required</u> to take pre-service or in-service training of any kind?

Yes 2( ) 18

No 1( )

34. (If yes), which of the following options <u>will satisfy</u> the requirement? (check all that apply)

Single conference or workshop . . . . . ( ) 19

Two or more conferences or workshops . . ( ) 20

Coursework in adult education . . . . . ( ) 21

Other (describe)_____( ) 22

35. Approximately what proportion of the total ABE teaching staff has had pre-service or in-service training in ABE?

<u>0%</u> <u>100%</u>

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 ( ) 23

36. How would you characterize the annual rate of ABE teacher turnover?

Heavy (25% or more) . . .3( ) 24

Moderate (24 to 11%) . . 2( )

Light (10% or less) . . .1( )

37. How much difficulty have you experienced in removing ABE teachers whose performance has been unsatisfactory?

<u>Little or no difficulty</u> <u>Great difficulty</u>

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 25

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

38. To what degree do you rely on the following means to recruit ABE students?

	Little or no degree						Great degree	
Announcements in mass media	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	26
Flyers, posters, mailings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	27
Referrals from welfare, employment, other agencies	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	28
Word of mouth	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	29
Recruitment by co-sponsoring groups . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	30
Direct recruitment by teachers, supervisors, or counselors	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	31
Organized recruitment by current ABE students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	32
Local residents used as recruitment aides	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	33
Staff member assigned to recruitment . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	34

List any other important recruitment device_____

_____ ( ) 35

39. Based on your own experience, how would you rate the effectiveness of each of the following methods of recruiting ABE students?

	Don't know	Not effective					Very effective		
Announcements in mass media . .	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	36
Flyers, posters, mailings . . .	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	37
Word of mouth	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	38
Recruitment by co-sponsors . .	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	39
Direct recruitment by teachers, supervisors, or counselors . .	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	40
Organized recruitment by current ABE students	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	41
Local residents used as recruitment aides	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	42
Staff member assigned to recruitment	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	43

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Materials

40. Has your staff developed instructional materials for use by various teachers in your ABE program? Yes 2( ) No 1( ) 44

41. (If yes), who developed them? (check all that apply)

Individual teachers (who share them) . . . . . ( ) 45

Committee of ABE teachers . . . . . ( ) 46

Staff curriculum specialist(s) . . . . . ( ) 47

Other (specify)_____ ( ) 48

42. Approximately what proportion of materials used for ABE instruction in your program are obtained from commercial publishers?

0% 100%

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 ( ) 49

43. Approximately what proportion of materials used for ABE instruction in your program have been developed, so far, by teachers or other ABE staff?

0% 100%

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 ( ) 50

44. How much influence do the following have in deciding what materials will be used for ABE instruction?

	Little or no influence						Great influence	
Teachers-in-charge, other supervisors. .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	51
Yourself	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	52
State ABE staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	53
Teachers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	54
ABE students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	55

List any others who influence materials selection_____ ( ) 56

_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Counseling

45. Are specialized staff who serve as counselors employed in the ABE program? Yes 2( ) No 1( ) | 57

46 (If counselors are employed), how many are full and how many part-time?

Full-time_____ | ( ) 58

Part-time_____ | ( ) 59

47. Approximately what proportion of the counseling staff are certified as counselors in the school system?

0% 100%

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 | ( ) 60

48. Approximately what proportion of counselor time is spent administering tests?

0% 100%

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 | ( ) 61

49. Are job placement services provided for ABE students? Yes 2( ) No 1( ) | 62

50. To what degree do the following factors contribute to the dropout problem?

	Little or no degree						Great degree	
Poor health	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	63
Transportation expense	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	64
Poor teaching	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	65
Work schedule	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	66
Discouragement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	67
Childcare	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	68
Curriculum not relevant to needs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	69

List any other major factors that contribute to the problem_____ | ( ) 70

_____ | ( ) 71

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

51. Is the dropout rate higher in day or evening classes?

Day classes . . . . . 1( ) 72

Evening classes . . . . . 2( )

Little or no difference . . 3( )

52. Is the dropout rate highest at the 1-3, 4-6, or 7-8 level, or is there little or no difference by reading level?

Higher at 1-3 level . . . . 1( ) 73

Higher at 4-6 level . . . . 2( )

Higher at 7-8 level . . . . 3( )

Little or no difference . . 4( )

53. Have you conducted a study to find out who drops out and why? Yes 2( ) 74

(If yes, please attach copy if available) No 1( )

Finances

54. Approximately what proportion of the total ABE budget comes from each of the following sources?

	0%										100%	CARD THREE
Fed. gov.	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	( ) 11
State gov.	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	( ) 12
Local gov.	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	( ) 13

List any other sources of support for ABE_____

_____

55. Is the local contribution in cash, in "kind" (e.g., use of facilities), or both?

In cash . . .1( ) 14

In kind . . .2( )

Both . . . . 3( )

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

56. Are local monies provided as a cushion pending receipt of federal funds? Yes 2( ) No 1( ) 15

57. To what degree is delay in receipt of federal funds a problem in the administration of the ABE program?

Little or no degree						Great degree	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	16

58. Do you have the actual (if not legal or official) authority for developing and administering the ABE budget? Yes 2( ) No 1( ) 17

(If no), who does? (title)_____ ( ) 18

Facilities

59. What is the approximate proportion of ABE classes held in school facilities?

0% 100%

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 ( ) 19

60. What is the approximate proportion of ABE classes held during the day (before 5 p.m.)?

0% 100%

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 ( ) 20

61. What is the approximate proportion of ABE classes held in centralized sites of 3 or more classes?

0% 100%

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 ( ) 21

62. To what degree do health, fire, or safety laws limit locating ABE classes in non-school facilities such as storefronts, churches, etc.?

Little or no degree						Great degree	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	22

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

63. Would you personally like to have more or fewer classes during the day?

More day classes. . . 3( ) | 23

Fewer day classes . . 2( )

No change . . . . . 1( )

64. Would you personally like to have more or fewer classes held in non-school facilities such as storefronts, churches, etc.?

More classes in non-school facilities. . . . 3( ) | 24

Fewer classes in non-school facilities . . . 2( )

No change . . . . . 1( )

Program

65. How many months during the year are ABE classes held?

_____ ( ) 25

66. How many hours per week do your ABE classes generally meet?

_____ ( ) 26

67. What is the approximate total number of ABE classes in each category?

English as a second language _____ ( ) 27 ( ) 28

Non-ESL ABE _____ ( ) 29 ( ) 30

68. What is your approximate total ABE enrollment in each category?

English as a second language _____ ( ) 31 ( ) 32

Non-ESL ABE _____ ( ) 33 ( ) 34

69. Are you required to discontinue an ABE class if enrollment drops below a certain level? Yes 2( ) | 35

No 1( )

70. (If yes), what is the minimum class size?

_____ ( ) 36 ( ) 37

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

71. Have you developed your own ABE curriculum guide, outline, or syllabus? Yes 2( ) No 1( ) 38

72. How much emphasis does your ABE program place on each of the following content areas or skills?

	Little or no emphasis					Great emphasis		
Reading, language skills	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	39
Arithmetic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	40
Health education	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	41
Consumer education	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	42
Civics, social studies	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	43
Ethnic or racial heritage	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	44
Coping skills (e.g., how to complete a job application, take a test, deal with landlords, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	45

73. Are content areas or skills other than the "3 r's" typically taught as separate units or are they integrated with instruction in the "3 r's"?

Taught as separate units . . . . . 1( ) 46
Integrated with "3 r's" . . . . . 2( )
Taught both ways . . . . . 3( )

74. Are ABE students whose native language is English placed in class on the basis of reading level?

Always . . . . . 3( ) 47
When possible . . . . 2( )
Never . . . . . 1( )

75. Are students whose native language is not English taught separately from those whose native language is English?

Always . . . . . 3( ) 48
When possible . . . . 2( )
Never . . . . . 1( )

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

76. (If yes), are non-English speaking students placed in class on the basis of English language proficiency? Yes 2( ) No 1( ) 49

77. How much emphasis is placed on the following teaching techniques in ABE classes for students whose native language is English?

	Little or no emphasis						Great emphasis	
Instruction geared to entire class	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	50
Instruction geared to small groups working at similar tasks or at similar grade levels	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	51
Instruction geared to individuals working alone	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	52

78. Is individual progress assessed at regular intervals (e.g., every 100 hours) by means of a standardized achievement test such as ABLE, CAT, Stanford, etc.? Yes 2( ) No 1( ) 53

79. How do you rate the importance of the following factors in judging the success of your ABE program?

	Little or no importance						Great importance	
Total enrollment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	54
Dropout rate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	55
Number of students placed in jobs or job training programs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	56
Number of students completing 8th grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	57
Learning gains measured by standardized achievement tests	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	58
Success in recruiting "hardcore," chronically unemployed persons	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	59

List any other factors that you feel are important in judging the success of your ABE program_____ ( ) 60

80. Is provision made for periodic, formal evaluation of your ABE program? Yes 2( ) No 1( ) 61

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

81. (If yes), who conducts the evaluation? (check all that apply)

State education department . . . . . 1( ) 62

School system evaluation office. . . . . 2( ) 63

Professor(s) from nearby college or university. . . . . 3( ) 64

Other (specify)_____ 4( ) 65

82. Directors of ABE programs sometimes develop or discover new practices that they consider to be especially effective or promising. During the past few years, have you developed or discovered any such practices in your ABE program?

Yes 2( ) 66

No 1( )

83. (If yes), please describe briefly the one or two most important practices that have been introduced in your ABE program.

_____

_____ ( ) 67

_____ ( ) 68

84. Listed below are a number of practices that are sometimes associated with ABE programs. For <u>each</u> check the <u>one</u> response category that best indicates the status of the practice in your own ABE program.

<u>Response Categories</u>

1 NEVER -- The practice has not been a part of our ABE program during at least the past 5 years.

2 STOPPED -- The practice was tried some time ago, but is no longer used in our ABE program.

3 STANDARD - The practice has been widely used and is now a standard part of our ABE program.

4 STARTED -- The practice has recently been started in our ABE program and we are exploring its usefulness and applications.

<u>Practices</u>	<u>Response Categories</u>				CARD FOUR
	NEVER	STOPPED	STANDARD	STARTED	
a. TV instruction for ABE	1	2	3	4	11
b. Paraprofessionals employed as teachers or teacher aides.	1	2	3	4	12

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Practices	Response Categories: NEVER	STOPPED	STANDARD	STARTED	
c.	Team teaching in ABE	1	2	3	4	13
d.	Majority of ABE teachers employed full-time	1	2	3	4	14
e.	Co-sponsorship of ABE with business, hospitals, other organizations, to upgrade employee skills	1	2	3	4	15
f.	Volunteers used as teachers, teacher aides, or counselors	1	2	3	4	16
g.	Child care facilities for mothers attending ABE classes	1	2	3	4	17
h.	Majority of ABE classes located in non-school facilities such as churches, storefronts, community centers, etc.	1	2	3	4	18
i.	Computer assisted instruction.	1	2	3	4	19
j.	Employment of community relations personnel as liason between ABE and the community.	1	2	3	4	20
k.	Learning laboratory used as alternative to traditional ABE classroom	1	2	3	4	21
l.	Learning laboratory used to supplement ABE classroom instruction.	1	2	3	4	22
m.	Majority of ABE classes held in one major facility	1	2	3	4	23
n.	Employment of counselor assigned exclusively to vocational counseling and job placement	1	2	3	4	24
o.	At least half of ABE operating budget from local sources	1	2	3	4	25
p.	Local residents employed as ABE recruiters	1	2	3	4	26
q.	Active community advisory board for ABE.	1	2	3	4	27
r.	Majority of students recruited by co-sponsoring groups	1	2	3	4	28

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Opinion Questions

85. Please circle the number in the right hand column that best indicates the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements about adult basic education.

	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree	
a. As a general rule, the greater the proportion of full-time teachers the better the ABE program.	1	2	3	4	5	29
b. The learning laboratory approach to ABE instruction is less effective than the regular classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	30
c. The federal government can be expected to maintain or increase its financial support of ABE in the next decade.	1	2	3	4	5	31
d. Educational technology (e.g., programmed instructional systems, instructional hardware, TV programming, etc.) holds little promise for improving ABE instruction.	1	2	3	4	5	32
e. Limited ABE resources should be used to assist those who are most disadvantaged even if this means reducing the total served.	1	2	3	4	5	33
f. ABE programs should include both vocational counseling and job placement services.	1	2	3	4	5	34
g. Cooperation with other agencies and organizations in the community is essential to the success of ABE.	1	2	3	4	5	35
h. The hard core unemployed are best served by ABE that is integrated with vocational training.	1	2	3	4	5	36
i. A major reason for the high dropout rate in ABE is that the classes do not meet the needs of many adults who enroll.	1	2	3	4	5	37
j. ABE has had substantial success in reaching the chronically unemployed or underemployed males commonly labeled "hard core".	1	2	3	4	5	38
k. Assessment of achievement by standardized tests at regular intervals (e.g., every 100 hours) is not necessary in ABE.	1	2	3	4	5	39
l. There are many commercial materials now available that are well suited to ABE instructional purposes.	1	2	3	4	5	40

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

About Yourself

86. Are you employed in ABE full or part-time?

Full-time 1( ) 41

Part-time 2( )

87. (If employed in ABE part-time), what is your regular position?

_____ ( ) 42

88. (If employed in ABE full-time), what was your last position?

_____ ( ) 43

89. How long have you been employed in your present position?

_____ ( ) 44

90. What is your sex?

Male 1( ) 45

Female 2( )

91. What is your age?

_____ ( ) 46

92. What is your official position (title)?

_____

We would appreciate receiving copies of reports or other materials that describe your ABE program. If available, please enclose.

THANK YOU

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, TEACHERS COLLEGE
New York, New York 10027

NATIONAL SURVEY OF ADULT BASIC EDUCATION TEACHERS

Conducted
by

ABE in the Inner City Project
Center for Adult Education
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

Project Director
Jack D. Mezirow

The work presented herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Grant No. OEG-0-70-5160(324)

Instructions

This questionnaire is part of a national study of urban public school ABE. The purpose of the study is to provide information to adult educators that will be useful in improving current practice. Results will be widely disseminated through workshops and publications.

Your responses will be kept strictly confidential. Only Center staff will have access to completed questionnaires. All results will be reported in summary form.

This questionnaire should take about ten minutes to complete. Please do not discuss the questions with your colleagues. Feel free to write your responses in your own words if the forced choice options do not fit your situation.

Your contribution to this study is most important and sincerely appreciated.

Sample Items

CHECKMARKS: Place checkmark in the parenthesis after the appropriate answer. Unless otherwise specified, make a checkmark in one space only.

Sample #1

Do you currently teach in an ABE program?

1(✓) Yes
2( ) No.

SCALES Circle one number only. If a question contains more than one scale, circle one number in each scale.

Sample #2

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements below.

	Disagree			Agree	
a. ABE should be limited to adults over 18. ..	1	2	(3)	4	5
b. ABE students should be charged tuition. ...	(1)	2	3	4	5

PROPORTIONS: Circle the number below the appropriate column.

Sample #3

About what proportion of your students are high school graduates?

Proportion High School Graduates			
0-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%
(1)	2	3	4

RANK ORDERING: Rank all items listed, assigning 1 to the highest rank, 2 to the next highest, 3 to the third highest, and so on for all items.

Sample #4

Rank order the importance to you of each of the following renovations by writing 1 in the space next to the most important renovation, 2 next to the second most important, and 3 next to the third most important.

a. New lighting ..... (2)
b. More blackboards ..... (1)
c. New, larger desks ..... (3)

1.

CARD ONE

1. Are you employed full-time (20 or more hours per week) or part-time in adult basic education (ABE)? 11

1( ) Part-time
2( ) Full-time

2. (If part-time), what is your full-time occupation? 12

1( ) Elementary school teacher (K-6)
2( ) Secondary school teacher (7-12)
3( ) Guidance counselor
4( ) School administrator or supervisor
5( ) Housewife
6( ) Other (specify) _____

3. (If full-time), what was your last full-time position? 13

1( ) Elementary school teacher (K-6)
2( ) Secondary school teacher (7-12)
3( ) Guidance counselor
4( ) School administrator or supervisor
5( ) Housewife
6( ) Other (specify) _____

4. (If full-time), are you 14

1( ) Paid by the hour
2( ) Salaried (on contract)

5. Do you hold tenure in your ABE position? 15

1( ) Yes
2( ) No
3( ) Don't know

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

6. What type of class(es) do you currently teach? 16

1( ) English as a second language (ESL)

2( ) Basic education for native born

3( ) Both ESL and basic education for native born

4( ) Other (specify) _____

_____

7. (If you teach basic education for native born), do you teach beginning, intermediate, or advanced level students? 17

1( ) Beginning level (1-3)

2( ) Intermediate level (4-6)

3( ) Advanced level (7 or higher)

4( ) Mixed (more than one level)

8. What time of day do you teach in ABE? 18

1( ) Day (before 5 p.m.)

2( ) Evening

3( ) Both day and evening

9. In what type of facility is your ABE class held? 19

1( ) Public school building

2( ) Industrial plant, business, hospital or other employer

3( ) Church or community organization facility

4( ) Other, including several facilities (specify) _____

_____

10. As of June, 1971, how many years of ABE teaching experience will you have had? _____ 20

11. There are many possible goals for ABE. Please rank the importance to you of the following goals by writing number 1 in the space next to the most important goal, number 2 next to the second most important goal, and so on for the five goals listed. Next, indicate by circling the appropriate number the approximate percentage of your current students who by June are likely to have achieved each of the goals listed.

Goals	Rank in Order of Importance	Proportion of Students Achieving Goal by June: 0-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%		
a. Increased self-confidence ...	( )	1	2	3	4	21	26
b. Completion of 8th grade equivalence	( )	1	2	3	4	22	27
c. Increased competency in language skills	( )	1	2	3	4	23	28
d. Preparation for high school equivalency exam	( )	1	2	3	4	24	29
e. Increased ability to cope with adult life roles and problems	( )	1	2	3	4	25	30

12. Most teachers emphasize some subjects more than others. In your own ABE teaching, how much emphasis do you give to each of the following subjects?

	Little or No Emphasis				Great Emphasis		
a. Arithmetic	1	2	3	4	5	31	
b. Reading, language skills	1	2	3	4	5	32	
c. Health education	1	2	3	4	5	33	
d. Consumer education	1	2	3	4	5	34	
e. Social studies, civics	1	2	3	4	5	35	
f. Ethnic or racial heritage ...	1	2	3	4	5	36	
g. Coping (how to apply for a job, obtain legal assistance, deal with landlords)	1	2	3	4	5	37	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

13a. Below is a list of factors which may interfere with teaching and learning in ABE. To what degree, if any, does each of the factors listed interfere with teaching and learning in your own classroom?

	Little or No Interference				Great Interference		
a. Irregular attendance	1	2	3	4	5	a 1	38
b. Class too large	1	2	3	4	5	b 2	39
c. Poor screening of students	1	2	3	4	5	c 3	40
d. Too much variation in student skill and/or ability levels	1	2	3	4	5	d 4	41
e. Low academic ability	1	2	3	4	5	e 5	42
f. Lack of motivation	1	2	3	4	5	f 6	43
g. Poor instructional materials	1	2	3	4	5	g 7	44
h. Student fatigue	1	2	3	4	5	h 8	45
i. Continuous enrollment of new students	1	2	3	4	5	i 9	46

13b. Please circle the letter next to the one factor above that most interferes with teaching and learning in your ABE classroom. 47

14. In your judgment, approximately what proportion of your current ABE students are making satisfactory progress in class? 48

1( ) 0-24%

2( ) 25-49%

3( ) 50-74%

4( ) 75-100%

15. Listed below are a number of characteristics sometimes attributed to ABE students. Please indicate the approximate proportion of your current students to which each characteristic applies.

Characteristics	Proportion of My Students with Characteristic: 0-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%	
a. Highly motivated	1	2	3	4	49
b. Lack self-confidence	1	2	3	4	50
c. Warm and friendly	1	2	3	4	51
d. Resent authority	1	2	3	4	52
e. Unrealistic expectations of time and effort required ..	1	2	3	4	53
f. Hypersensitive to criticism	1	2	3	4	54
g. Work hard in class	1	2	3	4	55
h. Low intellectual ability ..	1	2	3	4	56
i. Hard-core ghetto poor	1	2	3	4	57

16. Is an aide currently assigned to your ABE classroom? 58

1( ) Yes

2( ) No

If no aide, skip to question 20.

17. (If aide), is your current aide 59

1( ) A volunteer

2( ) A paid community paraprofessional

3( ) Other (specify) _____

_____

18. (If aide), how do you currently use your aide? 60

1( ) Mostly as co-teacher

2( ) Mostly tutors individuals

3( ) Mostly performs non-teaching tasks

4( ) Other (specify) _____

_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

19. (If aide), how important to the educational effectiveness of your classroom is the assistance of your current aide? 61

1( ) Very important

2( ) Somewhat important

3( ) Not important

4( ) Impedes effectiveness

20. We are interested in your feelings concerning administrative-supervisory aspects of ABE. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements below.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
a. ABE administrators are aware of my most important problems as a classroom teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	62
b. I get little feedback from administrators on how well I am doing my job.	1	2	3	4	5	63
c. The administration relies mostly on attendance figures to judge my performance.	1	2	3	4	5	64
d. I get little help with classroom problems from administrators or supervisors.	1	2	3	4	5	65
e. I have a great deal of autonomy in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	66
f. Teacher morale is high in this ABE program.	1	2	3	4	5	67
g. The administration does a good job supplying the necessary support services and materials....	1	2	3	4	5	68
h. The ABE administration does not provide adequate in-service education experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	69

CARD TWO

21. Approximately what proportion of your enrolled students are absent at any one class meeting? 11

1( ) Less than 10%

2( ) 10-24%

3( ) 25-49%

4( ) 50% or more

22. Many adults drop out of ABE before achieving their objectives. After the first five weeks of class, approximately what proportion of your students have dropped out for some reason? 12

1( ) Less than 10%

2( ) 10-24%

3( ) 25-49%

4( ) 50% or more

23. In your judgment, how important is each of the reasons listed below in accounting for the dropout problem? Rank order the five reasons by writing the number 1 in the space next to the most important reason, number 2 next to the second most important reason, and so on for the five reasons listed.

Reason	Rank in Order of Importance	
a. Moving away	( )	13
b. Work schedule	( )	14
c. Childcare	( )	15
d. Discouragement over progress	( )	16
e. Fear for personal safety	( )	17

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

24. Although most adults come to ABE to qualify for better jobs or to learn the English language, some come for other reasons. In your judgment, about what proportion of your current students are enrolled in ABE primarily for the reasons listed below?

Reason	Proportion of Students Enrolled: 0-10%	11-24%	25-49%	50% or more	
a. Family related (e.g., help children with homework)	1	2	3	4	18
b. Leisure related (e.g., meet other people, personal growth)	1	2	3	4	19

25. Have you had any pre- or in-service training specifically related to ABE? 20

1( ) Yes

2( ) No

26. (If you have had pre- or in-service training), please check in column "A" those training activities you participated in. For each activity checked in column "A" indicate the degree to which you found it helpful by circling the appropriate number under "B."

	A: Training in which I Participated	B: Little or No Help	Some Help	Great Help	
Local in- or pre-service workshop	( )	1	2	3	21 25
Observation of experienced teachers	( )	1	2	3	22 26
Regional summer workshop	( )	1	2	3	23 27
Coursework in adult education	( )	1	2	3	24 28

27. At the present time, how adequate is your preparation to teach in ABE? 29

1( ) Very adequate

2( ) Adequate

3( ) Inadequate

4( ) Very inadequate

28. (If you are currently employed full-time as an elementary or secondary school teacher), we would like you to contrast your experience teaching adults with your experience teaching children or adolescents. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements below.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
a. My adult students are less intellectually curious.	1	2	3	4	5	30
b. The atmosphere in my ABE classroom is more relaxed and informal.	1	2	3	4	5	31
c. My adult students are less capable of learning.	1	2	3	4	5	32
d. I have more professional autonomy in ABE.	1	2	3	4	5	33
e. My adult students are more homogeneous in ability and achievement.	1	2	3	4	5	34
f. My adult students are less highly motivated.	1	2	3	4	5	35
g. My adult students need more encouragement.	1	2	3	4	5	36
h. My adult students have more positive self-images.	1	2	3	4	5	37
i. I feel closer to my adult students.	1	2	3	4	5	38
j. Teaching adults is more personally satisfying.	1	2	3	4	5	39
k. I am more adequately prepared to teach adult students.	1	2	3	4	5	40

29. All things considered, do you find teaching in ABE 41

1( ) Very satisfying

2( ) Fairly satisfying

3( ) Not very satisfying

4( ) Not satisfying

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

30. The ultimate goal of ABE is often defined as the enhancement of the life chances of undereducated adults. In your judgment, how much difference does ABE make to the life changes of the average adult student? 42

1( ) Great difference

2( ) Some difference

3( ) Little difference

4( ) No difference

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

31. What is your sex? 43

1( ) Female

2( ) Male

32. Are you 44

1( ) Puerto Rican-American

2( ) Mexican-American

3( ) Black

4( ) White

5( ) Other (specify) _____

33. What is your age? 45

1( ) Under 30

2( ) 30-39

3( ) 40-49

4( ) 50-59

5( ) 60 or older

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABE IN THE INNER CITY PROJECT
NEW YORK CITY

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS
May 2-4, 1971

ABE Project Staff, Teachers College

Professor Jack D. Mezirow, Director
Professor Alan B. Knox, Associate Director
Dr. Gordon Darkenwald, Assistant Director
Miss Rita Breitbart, Administrative Assistant
Mr. Harold Beder, Research Assistant
Miss Marcelle Habibion, Research Assistant
Mr. Jack Mahon, Research Assistant

Workshop Participants

Mr. James M. Buckley
Director, Adult Basic Education
116 William Street
New Bedford, Massachusetts

Dr. Rebecca Butler
Adult Basic Education
3100 Federal Street
Camden, New Jersey

Professor Harlan G. Copeland
Syracuse University School of Education
105 Roney Lane
Syracuse, New York 13210

Mr. Raymond L. Dombrowski
Federal Programs Administrator
1511 Peach Street
Erie, Pennsylvania 16501

Miss Patricia Dumstra
Adult Basic Education
816 City Hall
Buffalo, New York

Mrs. Demetry T. DuRant
800 East City Hall Avenue
Norfolk, Virginia 23510

Mr. Gerardo Franciosa
Adult Basic Education
607 Walnut Avenue
Niagara Falls, New York 14301

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Miss Blanche E. Harris
Supervisor of ABE
Richmond City Schools
2020 Westwood Avenue
Richmond, Virginia 23230

Mr. Henry Horsey
Baltimore Public Schools
3 East 25 Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218

Mr. William M. Jacques
Washington Irving School
644 Madison Street
Syracuse, New York 13210

Mr. Richard Kelly
Adult Basic Education
249 High Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06103

Mr. William A. Lipscomb, Coordinator
Adult Basic Education
Menchville High School
275 Menchville Road
Newport News Virginia 23602

Professor Jack London
School of Education
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, California 94720

Mr. Paul Macciachera
Adult Basic Education
Board of Education
City Hall
Elizabeth, New Jersey

Mr. Gerald E. McGrain
Director of Extension Programs
20 Irving Street
Worcester, Massachusetts

Mr. Raymond E. Morrow, Director
Bureau of Adult Education
Springfield Public Schools
195 State Street
Springfield, Massachusetts 01103

Mrs. Doris Moss, Project Director
Title III ABE Program
130 CLinton Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dr. Mary C. Mulvey
Director, Adult Basic Education
53 Jenkins Street
Providence, Rhode Island

Mr. Garrett W. Murphy
Adult Basic Education
South Pearl and Rensselaer Street
Albany, New York

Professor Leonard Nadler
School of Education
George Washington University
Washington, D.C. 20006

Mr. James Oglesby
Principal, Woodstock Elementary School
6016 Providence Road
Virginia Beach, Virginia 23462

Mrs. Joan O'Gorman
Adult Basic Education
1 Highland Avenue
Yonkers, New York

Mr. Bill Paradise
Education Program Office
Division of Adult Education Programs
Room 5080--ROB 3
7th and D Streets, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Miss Mary I. Pendell
Adult Basic Education Program
Office of Education
Room 5068--ROB 3
7th and D Streets, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Mrs. Alice Perlman
Title III ABE
130 Clinton Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Mrs. Helen B. Pinzi
Director, ABE
294 Cedar Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06519

Mr. Henry V. Topoleski
Adult Basic Education Program
9 Van Cleef Street
Jersey City, New Jersey 07305

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mrs. Beatrice Smith
U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare
North Building
400 Independence Avenue, S.W.--Room 3047
Washington, D.C.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABE IN THE INNER CITY PROJECT

SAN FRANCISCO
WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS
May 14-16, 1971

ABE Project Staff, Teachers College

Professor Jack D. Mezirow, Director
Professor Alan B. Knox, Associate Director
Dr. Gordon Darkenwald, Assistant Director
Professor Winthrop Adkins, Research Associate
Professor Richard Videbeck, Research Associate
Miss Rita Breitbart, Administrative Assistant

ABE Project Staff, University of California Medical Center, San Francisco

Professor Barney Glaser
Mr. Roger Pritchard
Mr. Richard Rizzo

Workshop Participants

Mr. Fred B. Brash
Fresno Adult School
4472 East Tulare Avenue
Fresno, California 93702

Dr. Fritz Caskey
P. O. Box 200
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
Mr. Melvin V. Crites, Coordinator
Emily Griffith Opportunity School
1250 Welton Street
Denver, Colorado 80204

Mr. Paul Delker
Director, Adult Programs Division
Bureau of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education
U. S. Office of Education
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
7th and D Streets, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20202

Mr. Cleto Duran
Director, Adult Basic Education
Albuquerque Technical-Vocational Institute
525 Buena Vista, S. E.
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Professor James Farmer
Moore Hall
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

Mrs. Shirley Heymann, Coordinator
Adult Basic Education Program
Phoenix Union High School
525 North 7th Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85006

Mrs. Phil Jacobs, ABE Coordinator
Freemont Adult School
1401 - 24th Street
Sacramento, California 95816

Professor Glen Jensen
Department of Adult Education
College of Education
University of Wyoming
Laramie, Wyoming 82070

Mr. Larry Koeler
San Francisco Community College District
33 Gough Street
San Francisco, California 41303

Dr. James M. Kincaid, Jr.
Department of Education
213 Liberal Arts Building
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521

Mr. Edward Lindsey, Director
Pima County Adult Education Division
131 West Congress Street
Tucson, Arizona 85701

Mrs. Ruth Lindstrom
Elementary Counselor
Metropolitan Adult Education Program
81 North 7th Street
San Jose, California 95112

Professor Jack London
School of Education
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, California 94720

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mr. Floyd McKune
San Diego Community College
835 - 12th Street
San Diego, California 92101

Mr. Wallace McPhee, Coordinator
Adult Basic Education Program
2362 Bancroft - Room 21
Berkeley, California 94704

Mr. Calvin J. Nichols
Program Officer, Adult Education
Office of Education
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Room 351
50 Fulton Street
San Francisco, California 94102

Mr. John Nylen
Director of Adult Education
Alhambra Adult High School
101 South 2nd Street
Alhambra, California 91801

Professor Lester S. Perril
Coordinator, Adult Education Graduate Program
College of Education
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85281

Mr. Keith Roberts
Director of Adult Education
Long Beach Community College
1305 East Pacific Coast Highway
Long Beach, California 90806

Mr. Edward O. Salisbury
Salt Lake City Public Schools
1575 South State Street
Salt Lake City, Utah 84115

Dr. June Sheats
11490 Laurel Crest Drive
Studio City, California 91604

Professor Paul H. Sheats
324 Moore Hall
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mrs. Beatrice Smith
U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare
North Building
400 Independence Avenue, S. W.
Washington, D. C.

Mrs. Esther Stone
Department Head, Elementary Education and E.S.L.
Metropolitan Adult Education Program
81 North 7th Street
San Jose, California 95112

Mr. Sam Warren
Director of Adult Education
Whittier Adult Division Center
11962 East Florence Avenue
Santa Fe Springs, California

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABE IN THE INNER CITY PROJECT

CHICAGO
WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS
May 23-25, 1971

ABE Project Staff, Teachers College

Professor Jack D. Mezirow, Director
Professor Alan B. Knox, Associate Director
Dr. Gordon Darkenwald, Assistant Director
Professor Winthrop Adkins, Research Associate
Miss Rita Breitbart, Administrative Assistant

ABE Project Staff, University of Michigan

Professor Donald Warren
Miss Roberta Keane
Mr. Vernon Moore

Workshop Participants

Miss Vera Baymiller, Coordinator
Adult Basic Education Program
Manhattan and Elm Streets
Toledo, Ohio 43608

Mr. David Boggs
Project ENABLE
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

Mrs. Antronette Brown
Adult Education Center
1903 Paseo Boulevard
Kansas City, Missouri 64108

Mr. Rodger C. Clemmer
Principal of Adult Education Programs
Peoria Adult Education Center
412 Southwest Washington Street
Peoria, Illinois 61602

Mrs. Phyllis Cunningham
University of Chicago
5835 South Kimbark Ave.
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Mr. Lester V. Dziok
Director of Adult Basic Education
Holmes School
300 Southeast 5th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Professor William D. Dowling
Ohio State University College of Education
1945 North High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Mr. Jerry Drone, Coordinator
Adult Basic Education Program
773 South Main
Akron, Ohio 44311

Mr. La Ferrier, Director of Adult Education
Schools Center - Room 1214
5057 Woodward
Detroit Michigan 48202

Miss Del Finley, Coordinator
Adult Basic Education
2308 Carr Street
St. Louis, Missouri 63106

Miss Lucille Fischer
Adult Basic and Continuing Education Program
Mechanic Arts High School - Room 313
97 East Central Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Dr. James E. Flis
Duluth Public Schools
Board of Education Building
226 North First Avenue East
Duluth, Minnesota 55802

Professor William S. Griffith
The University of Chicago
5835 South Kimbark Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Professor John C. Gross
Department of Extension Education
University of Missouri - 222 Whitten Hall
Columbia, Missouri 65201

Mr. John N. Hatfield
Supervisor of Adult Basic Education
Ft. Wayne Regional Vocational Center
203 East Douglas
Ft. Wayne, Indiana 46802

Mrs. Georgia Anita Hayes
2928 North 24th Street
Omaha, Nebrask 68110

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Miss Joyce Hoffman
959 Turner Avenue, N.W.
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49504

Mr. Peyton Hutchison
Adlai Stevenson Building - Room 301
10100 Grand River Road
Detroit, Michigan 48204

Professor Russell J. Kleis
Michigan State University
427 Erickson Hall
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

Mr. Virgil Krampe, Supervisor
Adult Basic Education
3300 East 35th Street
Gary, Indiana 46402

Professor Bart Landry
Purdue University
Department of Sociology
Lafayette, Indiana 47907

Professor Carroll A. Londoner
Teachers College, University of Nebraska
105 University High School
Lincoln, Nebraska 68501

Mr. Nick Manych
Mott Adult High School
1231 East Kearsley Street
Flint, Michigan 48503

Mr. Vernon Miller
Board of Education
228 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois

Mr. Olifton Moseley
Adult Basic Education Program
773 South Main
Akron, Ohio 44311

Professor John Ohliger
Ohio State University College of Education
363 Arps Hall - 1945 North High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43210

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mrs. Lillian Patterson
Stowe Adult Center
635 West Seventh Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45203

Mr. Lewis Powell
Director of Adult Education
South Bend Community Schools
808 South Twyckendham Drive
South Bend, Indiana 46615

Mr. Jack Rolinger
2006 Ankeny Boulevard
Ankeny, Iowa 50021

Mr. M. Eldon Schultz
Regional Program Officer
U. S. Office of Education
226 West Jackson - Room 406
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Mr. Curtis D. Sederburg
Director, Adult Basic Education
Lincoln Technical College
2240 Vine Street
Lincoln, Nebraska 68503

Mr. M. Buell Snyder
Finzer Adult Center
730 East Broadway
Louisville, Kentucky 40202

Mr. Harold Wilson
ABE Consultant
Room 601 f - 120 East Walnut Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46202

Mrs. Margaret Zerby
Adult Basic Education
500 West Lenawee
Lansing, Michigan 48833

Mr. William L. Edwards
1380 East 6th Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Dr. Victor L. Stine
Director of Adult Education
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois 60115

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABE IN THE INNER CITY PROJECT

NEW ORLEANS
WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS
June 6-8, 1971

ABE Project Staff, Teachers College

Professor Jack D. Mezirow, Director
Professor Alan B. Knox, Associate Director
Dr. Gordon Darkenwald, Assistant Director
Professor Winthrop Adkins, Research Associate
Professor Richard Videbeck, Research Associate
Miss Rita Breitbart, Administrative Assistant
Mrs. Ann McLaughlin, Field Worker, Northeastern University

Workshop Participants

Mr. Laurence I. Ady
Supervisor of Adult Basic Education
2900 West Oak Ridge Road
Orlando, Florida 32809

Mr. Richard H. Bacon
Director of Adult and Vocational Education
662 South President Street - P.O. Box 2338
Jackson, Mississippi 39205

Mr. Archer P. Bardes
Supervisor of Adult Education Programs
Knox County Schools
Knoxville, Tennessee 37902

Mrs. Lois T. Baremore
Caddo Parish Schools
Shreveport, Louisiana 71101

Mr. Wayne Coffman
Wichita Falls Public Schools
1104 Broad
Wichita Falls, Texas 76301

Mr. Frank Commander
Department of Adult Education
College of Education
The University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30601

Mr. Wesley Driggs, Director
Adult Basic Education
1134 N.W. 8th Street
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mr. Eddy Echols
Director of Adult Basic Education
1161 West 40th Street
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37401

Mr. Joe Fuller
Atlanta Instructional Services Center
2930 Forrest Hills Drive, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30315

Mr. John Gilson
Adult Basic Education
318 - 11th Street
Columbus, Georgia 31901

Mr. James S. Gupton
Houston Independent School District
3830 Richmond Avenue
Houston, Texas 77027

Mr. Earle J. Hayes, Director
Adult Education Office
1323 Washington Street
Columbia, South Carolina

Mr. Pedro Hernandez, Jr.
Bexar County Adult Continuing Education
301 West Nueva Street
San Antonio, Texas 78207

Professor Eugene I. Johnson
Department of Adult Education
University of Georgia College of Education
Athens, Georgia 30601

Mr. Jimmie Jordon
2597 Avery Avenue
Memphis, Tennessee 38112

Mr. Charles R. Kelson
University of Texas, Division of Extension
201 Extension Building
Austin, Texas 78712

Mr. Charles J. Kilbert
Supervisor of Adult Basic Education
Orleans Parish School Board
703 Carondelet Street
New Orleans, Louisiana

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dr. Charles E. Kozoll
Associate Project Director, ABE
Southern Regional Education Board
130 Sixth Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30313

Mrs. Voncile T. Lackey
Board of School Commissioners of Mobile County
Post Office Box 1327
Mobile, Alabama 36601

Mr. David Lucas
Assistant Coordinator of ABE
1062 Forsythe Street
Macon, Georgia 31204

Mr. George L. Marsh
P.O. Box 45208
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74145

Mrs. Louise B. Maxey
P. O. Box 10007
Birmingham, Alabama 35202

Mr. Robert M. McAbee
Fort Worth Public Schools
1003 West Cannon
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

Dr. Louis H. Meeth, Jr.
Director of Adult Education
City Center of Learning
850 34th Street, South
St. Petersburg, Florida 33705

Mr. Chalmers Murray
Coordinator of Adult Education
1350 Southwest 2nd Court
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33302

Mr. Harvey Owen
Lubbock Public Schools
1715 - 26th Street
Lubbock, Texas 79411

Mr. Jerry Shoemaker
Stone Junior High School
2620 Clinton Avenue West
Huntsville, Alabama 35805

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mrs. Beatrice Smith
U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare
North Building
400 Independence Avenue, S. W.
Washington, D. C.

Mrs. Eloise Trent
Coordinator of Adult Basic Education
2309 Mitchell Avenue
Tampa, Florida 33602

Mr. Nick Vallado
Corpus Christi Public Schools
Box 110
Corpus Christi, Texas 78403

Mr. Donald Vickers
El Paso Public Schools
Box 1710
El Paso, Texas 79999

Mrs. Florence Weiland
Supervisor of Adult Education Programs
2601 Bransford Avenue
Nashville, Tennessee 37204

Mr. Donald E. Williams
Coordinator of Adult Basic Education
235 N. W. Third Avenue
Miami, Florida 33132

APPENDIX II, C

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABE WORKSHOP
ANONYMOUS PROGRAM EVALUATION FORM

Please circle the appropriate number in columns A and B below and write in column C any comments concerning your evaluation.

I.	A. Time Spent			B. Value					C. Comments (Mean Scores)				
Sunday night:	Too Little	About Right	Too Much	Little Value				Great Value	NYC	S.F.	Chi.	N.O.	N=77 Overall
Life Skills presentation.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5	3.47	2.72	3.82	3.81	3.45
Local program Directions.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5	--	3.20	3.06	3.67	3.31
Monday:													
Mezirow presentation.	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5	4.20	3.92	3.39	4.28	3.94
Knox presentation . .	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5	4.70	4.26	3.94	3.96	4.09
Group meetings:													
I (Knox, Chmn). . . .	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5	4.06	4.07	3.94	4.21	4.07
II (Mezirow).	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5	4.06	3.92	3.22	4.32	3.88
III (Darkenwald). . .	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5	3.78	3.69	3.72	3.78	3.64
Tuesday:													
Group applications meeting	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5	4.14	4.27	3.55	3.69	3.90
Discussions outside regular sessions. . .	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5	4.00	3.90	4.11	4.08	4.02
Workshop as a whole .	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5	--	4.27	4.00	4.33	4.20

II. What modifications in your program, if any, are you considering as a result of this workshop?

III. Can you suggest specific ways we might improve future workshops in other cities? (e.g., scheduling, organization, program, materials, arrangements) (Please use other side of page)